DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 845 UD 014 083

TITLE	Evaluation of Title I Decentralized Umbrella and Title I Optional Assignment Programs for Disadvantaged Pupils. District 24, New York City.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	31 Jul 73
NOTE	343p.; Function Number 79-31653, 31359, 31681
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	*Early Childhood Education; Educable Mentally Handicapped; English (Second Language); Guidance Programs; Nonpublic School Aid; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Preschool Programs; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Reading Programs; School Community Relationship; *School Districts; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *New York City

ABSTRACT

During the 1972-73 school year, Community School District 24 in New York City supplemented its regular school program with special educational services, funded under Title I of the 1965 Elementary Secondary Education Act. A primary objective of the Pre-Kindergarten Program was to develop children's understanding of basic concepts through a systematic program of guided pre-kindergarten experiences. A primary objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to develop an understanding of the basic concepts of quantity, space and time needed for success in the primary grades. The Bilingual Community Liaison Program attempted to develop positive relationships among community members, parents, and school personnel. The objective of the Educational Assistant for the Trainable Mentally Retarded Program was to extend individualization of instruction to CRMD pupils at P.S. 19 through the assistance of a paraprofessional as a means of promoting growth in specific behavioral areas related to academic performance. The Non-Public School program was developed in response to the needs of Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration schools. The primary objective of the Title I English as a Second Language Program was to increase participants' oral language fluency in English. A primary objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant. The objective of the guidance program for Optional Assignment pupils was to improve the behavior of pupils in academic and social skills. (Author/JM)

ED 087845

Function Nos. 79-31653
79-31654
79-31655
79-31656
79-31657
79-31658
79-31659
79-31681

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EVALUATION OF TITLE I DECENTRALIZED UMBRELLA AND TITLE I OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS

DISTRICT 24 NEW YORK CITY

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P1 89-10) performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1972-73 school year.

Project Co-Directors

Paul A. Cullinan
Angela M. Jaggar

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

July 1973

UD 014083

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The directors of the project wish to express appreciation to the following members of the professional staff of the evaluation team:

Professor Bernice E. Cullinan, New York University

Professor Harold Kindy, City University of New York

Professor Joan Henry Kindy, New York University

Professor Harvey Nadler, New York University

Professor Stephen Weiss, New York University

and the the Research Assistants:

Laurel Ladaro, Diana Leo, Brendan Maiers McGraw, Michal Pelzig, Maggie Ramsay, Bella Reiss, Carroll Seron, and Jean Weiss

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the Title I and Optional Assignment staff in all aspects of this evaluation. The cooperation of the pre-kindergarten and early childhood staff, the corrective reading teachers, the teachers of English to speakers of other languages, the guidance counselors, coordinators and the project director made this report possible.

Finally, we would like to thank the liaison officers, teachers, principals and pupils for their continued support and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY xi

INTRODUCTION xxxviii

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM 1

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM 13

BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM 60

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANT FOR THE TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED PROGRAM 71

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS PROGRAM 80

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM 99

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM 118

GUIDANCE SERVICES 180

APPENDICES 195

1. Pre-Kindergarten Program 195
2. Strengthened Early Childhood Program 200
3. Bilingual Community Liaison Program 250
4. English As A Second Language Program 255
5. Corrective Reading Program 260
6. Guidance Services 286

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 9. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Scores On The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts For Kindergarten, Grades 1 And 2.... 31

10. Comparison Of Kindergarten Pre- And Post-Program Scores On The New York City Pre-Reading Assessment. 33

11. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar Grade Equivalent Scores For First Grade On The Metropolitan Achievement Test Using The New York City Pre-Reading Assessment Score As The Covariate.... 35

12. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar Grade Equivalent Scores For Second Grade Students On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.... 36

13. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar Grade Equivalent Scores For Third Grade Students On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.... 37

14. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar First Grade Students' Math Gains On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.... 39

15. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar Second Grade Math Gains On The Metropolitan Achievement Test... 40

16. Comparison Of Distar And Non-Distar Math Gains On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.... 41

17. Analysis Of Second And Third Grades Actual And Anticipated Gains Using The Historical Rate Method With Grade Equivalent Scores In Reading And Math.. 43

18. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Academic Ratings And Behavior Problems Of Students Receiving Guidance Services At P.S. 143.... 45

19. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Training Ratings Of Kindergarten Teachers On Use Of Dominative/ Integrative Behavior.... 47

20. Comparison Of Teachers' And Judges' Ratings Of Teachers' Integrative/Dominative Behavior.... 48

21. Ratings Of Paraprofessional Skills And Services... 50

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Pre-Kindergarten Program

Table 1. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Scores For Pre-Kindergarten Students On The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts.......................... 4

2. Comparison Of Pre-Kindergarten and 5 Year Old Kindergarten Post-Program Scores On The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts.......................... 5

3. Comparison Of Pre-And Post-Program Ratings By Teacher, Educational Assistant, And Family Worker On The NYU Growth In Independence Rating Scale.... 7

4. Correlations Between Ratings By Staff On The NYU Growth In Independence Rating Scale And The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts.......................... 9

5. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Scores For Parental Involvement And Attitude................ 10

Strengthened Early Childhood Education Program

Table 1. Ratings Of Inservice Training..................... 16

2. Ratings Of Program Organization.................... 19

3. Ratings Of Physical Facilities And Materials...... 20

4. Ratings Of Program Operation....................... 22

5. Ratings Of Program Effectiveness................... 24

6. Ratings Of Parent Attitude And Involvement........ 26

7. Ratings Of Personnel Support....................... 28

8. Staff Comparisons Between 1971-72 And 1972-73 Programs And Interest In 1973-74 Program Participation....................................... 30

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 22. Level Of Spanish And English Speaking Parents' Involvement In School Activities - Percentage Data.. 53

23. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Mean Scores For Parental Attitude And Involvement............ 55

Bilingual Community Liaison Program

Table 1. Spanish Parents' Level Of Contact With And Ratings Of The Bilingual Community Liaison (Percentage Data)... 62

2. A Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Program Scores For Spanish Parents' Contacts With The BCL, Ratings Of BCL's Services And Attitude Toward School...... 65

3. Comparison Of Academic Performances Of Non-English Students Whose Families Had Contact With BCL With Non-English Students Whose Families Had No Contact With BCL, P.S. 143 First Grade.................. 68

The Non-Public School Program

Table 1. Analysis Of Covariance For First Grade On The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts...................... 87

2. Analysis Of Covariance For Second Grade On The Boehm Test Of Basic Concepts...................... 88

3. Comparison Of Our Lady Of Sorrows First Grade Distar And Non-Distar Students On The Post-Scores Of The Reading Subtest Of The S.R.A. Assessment Survey... 89

4. Comparison Of Our Lady Of Sorrows Second Grade Distar And Non-Distar Students On The Post-Scores Of The Reading Subtest Of The S.R.A. Assessment Survey... 89

5. Comparison Of Our Lady Of Sorrows Second Grade Distar And Non-Distar Students On The Post-Scores Of The Language Subtest Of The S.R.A. Assessment Survey.. 90

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 6. Test Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The *Gray Oral Reading Test* For Children At Transfiguration........................ 92

7. Test Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The *Metropolitan Reading Test* For Children At Transfiguration........................ 92

8. Test Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The Total Score Of The Math Subtest Of The *Metropolitan Achievement Test* For Students At Transfiguration................................ 94

9. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Scores On The Math Subtest Of The *Metropolitan Achievement Test* For Third Grade Students At Transfiguration........... 94

10. Comparison Of Pre- And Post-Scores On The Math Subtests Of The *Metropolitan Achievement Test* For Students In Other Grades At Transfiguration....... 96

English As A Second Language Program

Table 1. Comparison Of Elementary And Junior High School Students' Gains On The English *Oral Language Ability Scale* (OLAS)............................ 107

2. Comparison Of Number Of Subjects At Each Oral Language Fluency Level At The Beginning And End Of The Program.................................. 109

3. Comparison Of Elementary And Junior High School Gains On The *Linguistic Capacity Index* (LCI)...... 113

Corrective Reading Program

Table 1. Schools, Number Of Teachers And Number Of Students In The Title I And Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Programs.................................. 120

2. Corrective Reading Teachers' Evaluation Of Inservice Training Program................................. 126

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 3. Comparison Of Teachers', Principals', And Coordinator's Overall Evaluation Of Inservice Training Program.................................. 128

4. Mean Ratings For Program Organization, Physical Facilities And Materials.......................... 130

5. Mean Ratings For Pupil Selection, Diagnosis And Evaluation Procedures............................ 134

6. Mean Ratings For Student And Parent Attitudes Toward Program..................................... 138

7. Mean Ratings For Personnel Support................ 140

8. Number And Percentage Of Optional Assignment Students Showing Gains Below, The Same As And Above Anticipated Post-Test Scores On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.. 146

9. Tests Of Significance For Optional Assignment Students' Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On Vocabulary Subtest Of The Metropolitan Achievement Test...... 149

10. Tests Of Significance For Optional Assignment Students' Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On Comprehension Subtest Of The Metropolitan Achievement Test...... 150

11. Tests Of Significance For Optional Assignment Students' Actual And Above Anticipated Gains In Total Reading Score On The Metropolitan Achievement Test........ 151

12. Number And Percentage Of Optional Assignment Students Showing Gains Below, The Same As, And Above Anticipated On The Grade Level Score Of The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.......................... 154

13. Tests Of Significance For Optional Assignment Students' Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The Grade Level Score Of The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test..... 156

14. Tests Of Significance For Title I Students' Gains Above Anticipated On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.. 158

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 15. Number And Percentage Of Optional Assignment Elementary Students In The More Severely And Less Severely Retarded Groups Making Gains Below, The Same As, And Above Anticipated On The Metropolitan Achievement Test.............................. 159

16. Comparison Of Gains Of More Severely And Less Severely Retarded Optional Assignment Elementary Students On The Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 161

17. Pre- To Post-Test Gains Of Optional Assignment Students On The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.. 163

18. Pre- To Post-Test Title I Gains On The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.......................... 165

19. Pre- To Post-Program Change In Optional Assignment Students' Reading Attitude........................ 167

20. Pre/Post Difference In Title I Students' Reading Attitude.. 168

21. Comparison Of Optional Assignment Program With Tax Levy Program.................................. 170

Guidance Services

Table 1. Significant Differences In Academic And Social Skills For The Total O.A. Group................... 185

2. Comparison Of Gain In Academic Skills For O.A. Pupils In Counseling Groups And Those Not In Counseling Groups.............................. 186

3. Significant Differences In Social Skill Areas For O.A. Pupils Not In Counseling Groups.............. 187

4. Comparison Of Teacher Ratings Of Academic Skills Of O.A. Children In Corrective Reading With Those Not In Corrective Reading............................ 188

5. Significant Gains In Negative Social Skills For O.A. Pupils Not In Corrective Reading............ 189

List of Tables (Continued)

Page

Table 6. Comparison Of Elementary O.A. Pupils With Junior High School O.A. Pupils On Academic Skills........ 190

7. Significant Differences For Junior High School O.A. Pupils In Social Skills Rating.................... 191

8. Comparison Of O.A. Pupils In Groups With Residents In Groups On Academic Skills Ratings.............. 191

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 1972-1973 school year, Community School District 24 in New York City supplemented its regular school program with special educational services. Funds received under Title I E.S.E.A. were applied under two headings: District Umbrella which included a Pre-Kindergarten Program, a Strengthened Early Childhood Program, Bilingual Community Liaison, an Educational Assistant for the Trainable Mentally Retarded, Non-Public School Programs and an English as a Second Language Program; and Optional Assignment Services for open enrollment pupils which included a Corrective Reading Program and Guidance Services.

The major objectives, findings and recommendations of each program are summarized below.

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The primary objectives of the Pre-kindergarten Program were:

1. To develop children's understanding of basic concepts through a systematic program of guided pre-kindergarten experiences.

2. To develop children's independence in their care of self and personal property.

3. To improve participants' communication skills of speaking and listening.

4. To develop participants' proficiency in manipulation and purposeful use of learning materials.

5. To stimulate growth of participants in perceptual and classificatory skills related to intellectual development. Specifically, these skills include discrimination of color, form, and quantitative attributes of concrete objects and pictorial representations.

6. To enhance growth in social and emotional development.

7. To increase parent involvement in the educational program and to change educational attitudes in a positive direction.

Findings and Recommendations. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the objectives were achieved. The following findings support that conclusion.

1. Standardized testing results indicate that children in the Pre-kindergarten Program significantly increased the level of their knowledge of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades.

2. Subjective ratings of pupil behavior indicate that children increased the level of independence in personal care, communication skills, manipulation of materials, intellectual skills and social and emotional skills.

3. A comparison between the post-program scores of the Pre-kindergarten children and the five year old kindergarten children show the Pre-kindergarten scores to be significantly

higher than the scores for the five year old kindergarten. This indicates that the nature of the Pre-Kindergarten Program is effective for teaching children an understanding of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades. It is recommended that the Pre-Kindergarten Program be examined and appropriately extended into the five year old kindergarten.

4. Staff ratings of pupil behavior are more reliable at the end of the year than they are at the beginning of the year and generally are not trustworthy measures of pupil growth.

5. The program for involving parents and increasing the positive nature of their attitudes appeared to be successful.

6. It is recommended that the Pre-Kindergarten Program be continued.

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The primary objectives of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program were:

1. To develop an understanding of the basic concepts of quantity, space and time needed for success in the primary grades.
2. To develop basic skills related to reading competence.
3. To develop basic math concepts and computation skills.
4. To screen children who may have special learning problems and provide guidance services in dealing with those problems.

5. To improve teachers' awareness of interactive skills toward providing a positive classroom atmosphere for developing independence and decision making among kindergarten children.

6. To expand the educational role of the paraprofessional, through training and experience, as complementary to the teacher and thus more effective in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program.

7. To increase (a) parental involvement in the child's educational program and to change (b) parental attitudes toward education.

Findings. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the objective for understanding basic concepts was not achieved. The objective for increasing basic reading skills was achieved. The objective to develop basic math concepts was achieved for grade 3 but not for grades 1 and 2. The objective related to guidance services was achieved for P.S. 143 but not for P.S. 19. The objective related to teachers' awareness of interactive skills was achieved. The objective for expanding paraprofessional services was achieved. The objective of increasing parental involvement was achieved but the objective to increase the positive nature of parents' attitudes was not achieved. The following findings support these conclusions.

1. The process data showed that paraprofessionals rated all aspects of the program higher than the teachers did.

2. The Distar Reading Program was rated higher by Strengthened Early Childhood staff than the Distar Language and Math Programs.

3. The Strengthened Early Childhood staff rated the level of parental involvement lower than other aspects of the program.

4. The level of personnel support, as viewed by the Strengthened Early Childhood staff, is well above average.

5. The majority of the Strengthened Early Childhood staff found the 1972-1973 program to be superior to the 1971-1972 program and want to participate in a similar program next year.

6. Objective one, to develop students' understanding of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades, was not achieved. The Distar Language Program did not produce significantly higher scores for children in the program than comparable children achieved in a regular program.

7. Objective two, to develop basic reading skills, was achieved for kindergarten, grades 1, 2, and 3. Students in the Distar Reading Program achieved significantly more in reading than comparable students in a regular program.

8. Objective three,to develop basic math concepts and computation skills,was not achieved in grades 1 and 2, but was achieved for grade 3. Students in the Distar Math Program in grades 1 and 2 gained significantly less in math concepts and computation skills than comparable students in a regular program. Students in the Distar Math Program in the third grade gained significantly more in math concepts and computation skills than comparable students in a regular program.

9. Using the historical rate of growth method to analyze students' current performance compared to their previous performance, students in the control and experimental second and third grades made significantly greater gains in reading and math than those anticipated for them. Students in the experimental groups in the second grade did not make higher gains above anticipated in math than students in a regular second grade program. Students in the experimental groups in the third grade made higher gains above those anticipated in math than students in a regular third grade program. Students in the experimental groups in the second and third grades made higher gains above those anticipated in reading than students in regular second and third grade programs.

10. Students who received guidance services at P.S. 143 made a significant increase in teachers' ratings of their academic performance and a significant decrease in teachers' ratings of their behavior problems.

11. Kindergarten teachers who received training in the analysis of classroom atmosphere became significantly more aware of their dominative and integrative behavior.

12. Paraprofessionals are involved in a full teaching role in the Distar Programs. Strengthened Early Childhood staff associated with paraprofessionals view their services as above average. Nine of the 20 paraprofessionals are bilingual.

13. The level of parental involvement increased significantly during the school year, but the nature of parents' attitudes did not change.

Recommendations. Based on the above findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Distar Reading Program should be continued and refined. Teacher preference for using the Distar Reading Program should be considered in selecting staff for the program.

2. The Distar Language Program should be discontinued. The content of the program does not appear to meet the language needs of the population in District 24.

3. The Distar Math Program should be continued at the third grade level. The Distar Math Program at grades 1 and 2 should be discontinued. The math program used in the control school should be examined for possible use in the experimental schools.

4. Guidance services of the type provided at P.S. 143 should be continued and expanded. A guidance program must be initiated and evaluated at P.S. 19.

5. Use of video tape analysis for training teachers to become aware of their dominative and integrative behavior should be continued and expanded.

6. Paraprofessionals appear to be a vital part of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program. Use of their services should be increased and their training continued. The addition of more bilingual paraprofessionals should continue.

7. The program for parental involvement should be continued and expanded. A program of parent education to increase the positive nature of parents' attitudes is warranted.

BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The program objectives for the Bilingual Community Liaison (BCL) were as follows:

1. To develop positive relationships among community members, parents and school personnel and to promote positive attitudes toward education.

2. To improve the academic performance of non-English speaking children.

Findings. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that parental involvement increased but parents' level of satisfaction with the Bilingual Community Liaison and their positive attitudes toward education did not increase. The objective to improve academic performance of non-English speaking children was not achieved. The following findings support these conclusions.

1. The number of contacts between Spanish speaking parents and the Bilingual Community Liaison increased significantly during the 1972-1973 academic year.

2. The level of parental satisfaction with the services of the Bilingual Community Liaison did not change substantially from the beginning of the program to the end.

3. Spanish speaking parents did not significantly increase the positive nature of their attitudes toward the schools during the year.

4. The academic performance of non-English speaking children was not increased significantly by contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

5. Less than 15 percent of the non-English speaking population in P.S. 19 and P.S. 143 had direct contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

Recommendations

1. On the basis of the findings of this evaluation, it is recommended that the Bilingual Community Liaison Program be drastically revised or discontinued.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANT FOR THE TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED PROGRAM

Program Objective. The objective of the program was to extend individualization of instruction to CRMD pupils at P.S. 19 through the assistance of a paraprofessional as a means of promoting growth in specific behavioral areas related to academic performance.

Findings. The Educational Assistant with TMR pupils at P.S. 19 provides valuable services to those pupils.

1. Evidence from teacher ratings, work of pupils, and observation/interview procedures indicate that pupils are receiving additional individualized instruction because of the Assistant's presence and that such instruction leads to pupil learning. In large part, the success of the program is due to the amount and quality of supervision offered to the Assistant and to the personality characteristics of the individual in that role.

2. The Educational Assistant is now used only with TMR pupils. This is an important, positive change from 1971-1972 and follows recommendations made in the evaluation at that time.

Recommendations. The following recommendations may by made on the basis of the above findings.

1. The Educational Assistant should be encouraged to take course work relevant to her role with TMR pupils to gain additional technical instructional skills.

2. Greater use of the Educational Assistant's skill in sewing and homemaking could be made with TMR pupils.

3. An additional Educational Assistant for EMR pupils should be employed. Those children would require a person with different personal and professional skills but would profit from supplemental remedial instruction.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

Program Objectives. In response to the needs of Our Lady of Sorrows and Tranfiguration schools, the following objectives were delineated.

Our Lady of Sorrows

1. To develop understanding of basic concepts of quantity, space, and time needed for success in the primary grades.

2. To develop reading skills of first and second grade children through a systematic instructional program (Distar).

Transfiguration

3. To provide corrective reading, math and English as a Second Language instruction to children who are reading below

grade level, who are in need of corrective math, and who need English as a Second Language.

Findings. The evaluation of the non-public school program resulted in the identification of some trends but not conclusive evidence of the program's effectiveness. Problems associated with the initiation of a new program and late pre-testing combine to produce results that are tenuous. The following statements drawn from the data presented in this report should not be considered as conclusive ones.

1. The first and second grade Non-Distar groups at Our Lady of Sorrows gained significantly more than the Distar groups in understanding basic concepts of time, space and quantity.

2. The Non-Distar groups at Our Lady of Sorrows achieved significantly higher post test scores on a reading and language test than did the Distar groups. Pre-test measures were not available to see if the groups were comparable at the beginning of the program.

3. Students in the corrective reading program at Transfiguration in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 made significant gains above those anticipated for them in reading as measured by the Gray Oral Reading Test. Students in grade 7 did not make gains above those anticipated.

4. Students in the corrective reading program at Tranfiguration in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 made significant gains in reading when actual pre to post test scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were compared, however, only the ninth grade students made significant gains when their anticipated post test scores were compared to their actual post test scores.

5. Students in the corrective math program at Transfiguration made significantly larger gains than those anticipated for them.

Recommendations. Based on a recognition of the tenuous nature of the conclusions drawn above, and observation and interview data, the following recommendations are made.

1. The Distar Programs should be continued at Our Lady of Sorrows and the effectiveness of the program should be tested adequately. The results of this evaluation cannot be used as definitive evidence of their effects on students.

2. The corrective reading and math programs at Transfiguration should be continued. By reducing staff changes, increased stability can be brought to the program.

3. The English as a Second Language Program was not evaluated since no adequate growth measures were obtained. The continuation of this program is a decision to be made by the staff involved until a complete evaluation is conducted.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Program Objective. The primary objective of the Title I English as a Second Language Program was to provide instruction in English as a second language in order to increase program participants' oral language fluency in English.

Findings. Program records, observations by the evaluation team, and interviews with the staff revealed that the ESL Program implemented at each school represented substantial modifications in the structure of the proposed program. These modifications did result in a greater number of students being serviced by the program, however, they also resulted in a concomitant reduction in the amount of English language instruction received by program participants.

Two language measures were used to assess pupil growth in English language proficiency. Analysis of pre and post program scores on the two measures resulted in the following findings:

1. Both elementary and junior high school students in the program made significant gains in receptive and productive English language skills as measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index (LCI) and by teachers' ratings on the "A-F" Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS).

2. Elementary school children made significantly greater gains than junior high school students in knowledge of English structural patterns and in their ability to use English to interpret situations as measured by teacher ratings on the OLAS. Junior high school students showed the greater gains in the speech skills of pronunciation and intonation. Although elementary students showed slightly greater gain in vocabulary and in total oral English fluency, their gains in these two areas were not significantly greater than those of the junior high students.

3. Elementary school children manifested gains in all receptive English language skills measured by the LCI that were significantly and substantially greater than the gains of the junior high school students.

4. Examination of the number of children at each oral fluency level at the beginning and at the end of the program, revealed that, according to teacher ratings, children at the lowest oral fluency level at the beginning of the program are the ones who made the greatest gains. In addition, teacher ratings on the OLAS suggested that most children who were rated at the higher levels initially ("D" and "C") made no gains in their basic oral English fluency scores. Rather than reflecting the actual language situation among program participants, it is more likely that these findings reflect the basic inadequacy of using teacher.

ratings as a measure of language growth. Teacher ratings are subjective and, in general, are least adequate for measuring gains among children with some facility in English where measurement of increases in language facility requires more refined instruments. As indicated in last year's evaluation report, the Oral Language Ability Scale can be used "to identify F-rated children, those who are unable to respond satisfactorily. It is less appropriate for discriminating among "E," "D" or "C" level children."

Although the findings cited above indicate that children in the ESL Program manifested significant pre to post program gains in English language proficiency, no conclusive statements can be made about the program's effectiveness. Since no comparison group was available as a control, it is difficult to determine if the gains made by program participants were greater than might have been expected without special instruction.

Recommendations. Based on the above findings the following recommendations are made for the English as a Second Language Program.

1. Efforts should be made to structure the ESL Program so that students receive a sufficient amount of daily instruction in English on a regular basis. In general, growth in language skills is related to the amount of instruction received.

2. A study should be made of the nature and extent of fluctuation in the target population at each school. There is a need for greater stability in the program population. Efforts should be made to provide English instruction to new students admitted during the year without transferring other students to mainstream classrooms before they have developed facility in English that is adequate for successful achievement in the regular classroom curriculum.

3. Because of the subjective nature of teacher ratings, it is suggested that whenever possible more objective measures, such as the *Linguistic Capacity Index*, also be used. Multiple measures provide more accurate information for pupil selection, for diagnosis of children's language strengths and weaknesses, and for assessment of pupil achievement in learning English as a second language.

4. Analysis of pre and post program scores did indicate that the elementary school children made substantially greater gains in English than did the junior high students. Although the greater language learning facility generally found among younger children may account for this difference, other factors such as differences in instructional approach, program structure or teacher effectiveness may have been operating. These and other factors should be examined in order to determine how the effectiveness of the program might be increased.

5. As recommended in last year's evaluation report, although proficiency in oral English is essential, it is not sufficient for total school success. The program should be extended to include the development of skills in writing and reading English.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The primary objectives of the Corrective Reading Program were:

1. To provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant so that he will increase his competence in reading.

2. To increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofesionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading.

Findings for Growth in Reading Achievement. The data presented in the report support the conclusion that the Optional Assignment and Title I Corrective Reading Programs were generally successful in achieving the first objective. The following findings support this conclusion.

1. When actual post-test performance was compared to anticipated performance, 68 percent of the Optional Assignment children achieved gains higher than expected in word knowledge, 54 percent achieved gains higher than expected in reading comprehension, and 62 percent achieved above anticipated in total reading.

Thus, more than half of the Optional Assignment students exceeded performance normally expected of them in each of the three areas measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Similar results obtained for the grade level score on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, indicating that 60 percent of the Optional Assignment students achieved gains above expected in reading comprehension.

2. Grade level comparisons showed that the word knowledge gains made by the Optional Assignment students were significantly above anticipated for all grade levels except the third grade. However, only the fifth, sixth and ninth graders achieved gains significantly above those anticipated for them in reading comprehension. The fourth, seventh and eigth graders averaged post-test reading comprehension scores higher than expected but their gains were not significantly above those expected. The third graders achieved only at their expected rate of growth based on previous performance. The results indicate the program was more effective at developing Optional Assignment students' reading vocabulary than it was at developing skill in reading comprehension, as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test.

3. On the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, all grade levels in the Optional Assignment Program, except the third and the seventh grades, made gains significantly above those anticipated for them. This finding highlights further

the weaknesses in the program at the third grade level.

4. Analysis of pre-to post-program scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test revealed that Optional Assignment students at all grade levels made average gains that were significantly above those anticipated for them in reading comprehension as measured by this test.

5. Comparison of total group pre-and post-program performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test showed that students in the half year Title I Program made gains that were significantly above expected in word knowledge, comprehension, and total reading.

6. Comparisons of the gains of the more severely and less severely retarded elementary readers in the Optional Assignment Program revealed that approximately the same percentage of children in each group made gains above anticipated in comprehension and in total reading; however, a larger percentage of the more severely retarded readers achieved gains above anticipated in word knowledge.

7. Both groups, the more severely and less severely retarded readers, achieved gains significantly above anticipated in word knowledge and total reading; however, only the more severely retarded readers achieved significantly above anticipated in reading comprehension. There was evidence that the program was more effective with the more seriously retarded readers, suggesting a direct relation between amount of instruction and improvement in reading.

Findings for Growth in Specific Reading Skills. The second objective of the Optional Assignment and Title I Corrective Reading Program was to provide diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction in order to increase pupils' ability in specific reading skills. The findings presented in this report support the conclusion that the program objective was met. The findings were:

1. Optional Assignment students who were administered Level I and Level II of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test manifested significant gains in all skill areas measured.

2. Title I students exhibited significant pre-to post-program gains in all skill areas measured by the Level I Stanford, and in all areas, except one, that are measured by the Level II Stanford. The exception was in rate of reading where the intermediate school children achieved a post-test score that was lower, but not significantly different from their pre-test score.

Findings for Improvement in Reading Attitude. The third objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase students' positive attitudes toward reading. The data reported support the conclusion that both the Optional Assignment and the Title I Corrective Reading Programs did little to change program participants' attitudes toward reading and that, in fact, this program objective was not achieved.

Findings for Impact of Paraprofessional Services. The last objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase individualization of instruction through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading at the elementary level. The findings that there were no significant differences in the performance of the two groups indicate that the additional services provided by the paraprofessionals did not lead to significantly greater improvement in reading achievement and attitude toward reading.

Recommendations. Again this year there was evidence that the Corrective Reading Program was generally effective in improving program participants' level of reading achievement. The recommendations which follow are made toward the goal of continued improvement of the program. It should be noted that many reemphasize recommendations previously made.

1. The repeated low achievement of third graders deserves careful study. This was the only grade level group that showed no significant gains above those expected for them based on previous performance.

2. There was evidence that the program was more effective in improving reading word knowledge than it was in developing comprehension skills. Every effort should be made to improve instruction in reading comprehension.

3. There was evidence that the more severely retarded readers made greater gains than the less severely retarded readers, suggesting that improvement in reading is directly related to the amount of instructional time. The staff should continue to make every effort to accurately assign the more severely retarded readers to the instructional groups that meet more frequently.

4. Continued use of more than one measuring instrument for selection and diagnosis is highly recommended.

5. Approximately one-third of the retarded readers still did not achieve at their expected rate of growth indicating that there are some weaknesses in providing appropriate instruction to all children in the program. Every effort should be made to determine the causes for this weakness as a basis for making improvements in the instructional program.

6. Continued effort is needed to select well trained teachers for the program which requires specialized skills in the teaching of reading. Specific criteria must be identified and used in corrective reading teacher selection. If this is presently not possible, them there is evidence for the continuation of a strong inservice training program to upgrade the skills of the present staff.

7. If a program objective is to provide individualized instruction through the services of a paraprofessional as a means of improving students' reading achievement, then the role of the paraprofessional should be primarily an instructional one. To achieve this the paraprofessionals need specialized training in reading instruction, and the teachers need training in working with paraprofessionals. If paraprofessionals are not used in instructional roles, then this aspect of the program should be reassessed.

8. There is again evidence that additional time is needed for the Corrective Reading Teachers to confer with parents and classroom teachers who should play a significant cooperative role in the resolution of reading problems.

9. The District 24 staff should continue to move in the direction of strengthening the developmental reading program so that the separate Corrective Reading Program can be phased out. The reading specialist in each school could then assume the role of a reading resource teacher in assisting classroom teachers with their reading program.

GUIDANCE SERVICES

Program Objective. The objective of the guidance program for Optional Assignment pupils in District 24 during 1972-1973 was to improve the behavior of pupils in academic and social skills.

Findings for Improvement of Academic and Social Skills. The data in this report support the conclusion that the objective of improving the academic and social skills of students was achieved. The following findings support that conclusion.

1. In examining the data, it was found that there were statistically significant increases in all academic skills areas in all comparisons made. Thus, teachers perceived Optional Assignment pupils and residents who participated in groups as having made gains in reading, math social studies, creative expression and science. The only exception was in the science area for the comparison of Optional Assignment pupils in counseling groups with resident pupils in counseling groups, where the gains were not statistically significant for either subgroup. It is also noteworthy, that Optional Assignment pupils who participated in counseling groups made greater gains than those who were not in counseling groups. The conclusion can be drawn that Optional Assignment pupils in District 24 increased their skills in academic areas, based upon ratings of the teachers who were most familiar with their work during the academic year. It can

also be concluded that group counseling had an impact upon gains in academic skills.

2. In summarizing the data with regard to the social skills areas, Optional Assignment pupils' behaviors generally did not change in the desired direction. Whereas the negative social skill areas were hopefully to have decreased, in most cases there were generally more incidents of these behaviors at the end of the year than at the beginning. Whereas the positive social skills hopefully would have increased, there was not evidence of significant increases in most cases.

3. One significant set of results with regard to the counseling program was that, when the Optional Assignment pupils' who participated in counseling groups were compared to Optional Assignment pupils' who did not participate, the group participants increased significantly in only one negative area whereas the non-group participants increased in all seven negative areas. The conclusion can be drawn that group counseling contributed positively in the social skills area.

4. Another significant set of results can be seen when Corrective Reading pupils were compared to those not in Corrective Reading. The feelings of Corrective Reading participants were less easily hurt at the end of the year, and there were no increases in the negative areas. However, there were

significant increases in all negative areas for pupils not in Corrective Reading. The conclusion can be drawn that the Corrective Reading program contributed positively in the social skills area.

5. Finally, the comparison of elementary and junior high school Optional Assignment pupils yielded interesting results. Whereas, all negative social skills areas increased for junior high pupils, as did the positive area of following directions, no areas increased for elementary pupils. In fact, teachers reported elementary pupils as becoming less inattentive and as having their feelings less easily hurt.

Recommendations. The following recommendations, based on the data, are made for future consideration by District 24 personnel:

1. The group counseling aspect of the guidance program should be continued;

2. The Corrective Reading Program should be continued;

3. Further study should be made of the relationship between the above two programs and social skill development.

The following recommendations, based on professional knowledge of the evaluators, are also made for future consideration:

1. The position of Coordinator should be maintained;

2. Guidance services for all Optional Assignment pupils should be reinstituted.

INTRODUCTION

During the 1972-73 school year, the regular educational programs in District 24 New York City were supplemented with special educational services funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This evaluation report treats the programs funded under the following headings:

I.	Pre-Kindergarten Program at P.S. 143	(79-31653)
II.	Strengthened Early Childhood Education Program	(79-31654)
III.	Bilingual Community Liaison Program	(79-31655)
IV.	Educational Assistant for the Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) Program at P.S. 19	(79-31656)
V.	Non-Public Schools Program	(79-31657)
VI.	English as a Second Language Program	(79-31659)
VII.	Diagnosis and Treatment of Reading Disabilities Program (Corrective Reading)	
	Title I Program	(79-31658)
	Optional Assignment Program	(79-31681)
VIII.	Guidance Services for Optional Assignment Students	(79-31681)

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The objectives for the District 24 Pre-Kindergarten Program were as follows:

1. To develop children's understanding of basic concepts through a systematic program of guided pre-kindergarten experiences.

2. To develop children's independence in their care of self and personal property.

3. To improve participants' communication skills of speaking and listening.

4. To develop participants' proficiency in manipulation and purposeful use of learning materials.

5. To stimulate growth of participants in perceptual and classificatory skills related to intellectual development. Specifically, these skills include discrimination of color, form, and quantitative attributes of concrete objects and pictorial representations.

6. To enhance growth in social and emotional development.

7. To increase parent involvement in the educational program and to change educational attitudes in a positive direction.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In order to assess progress toward the program objectives, the following evaluation objectives were delineated:

1. Given pre-test/post-test scores on the *Boehm Test of Basic Concepts*, children in the program will manifest significant growth in understanding basic concepts.

2. Given the *New York University Growth in Independence Rating (GIR) Scale*, Section A, on a pre-test/post-test basis, children in the program will demonstrate significant gains in their care of personal property.

3. Given the *New York University GIR Scale*, Section B, children in the program will demonstrate significant gains in their communication skills of speaking and listening.

4. Given the *New York University GIR Scale*, Section C, children in the program will demonstrate significant gains in their manipulation and purposeful use of learning materials.

5. Given the *New York University GIR Scale*, Section D, on a pre-test/post-test basis, children in the program will demonstrate significant gains in their perceptual and classificatory skills related to intellectual development.

6. Given the *New York University GIR Scale*, Section E, on a pre-test/post-test basis, children in the program will demonstrate significant gains in social-emotional development.

7. Given a pre-test/post-test index of parental attitude and involvement, parents will manifest demonstrable change in (a) involvement, and (b) educational attitudes.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Data used to assess pupil growth were collected from the administration of a standardized test and teacher ratings on the New York University GIR Scale (see Appendix A). The level of parental involvement and the nature of parental attitudes were assessed through the use of a questionnaire (see Appendix B).

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Students' Understanding of Basic Concepts. The primary objective of the Pre-Kindergarten Program was to develop children's understanding of basic concepts considered to be necessary for success in the primary grades. The Boehm Test of Basic Concepts which assesses concepts of time, space and quantity was used to measure progress toward this objective. Comparisons were made between the pre- and post-program scores of children in the program. Sample size, means and standard deviations for the pre- to post-test comparison are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF PRE-AND POST-PROGRAM SCORES FOR PRE-KINDERGARTEN STUDENTS ON THE BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS

(N=27)

Pretest Mean	S.D.	Posttest Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	S.D.	F-Ratio
18.89	7.57	42.78	4.26	23.89	6.11	412.72*

*p $<$.000

An analysis of variance for correlated groups was performed on the pre- and post-program scores of the Pre-Kindergarten students. The F-ratio shown in Table 1 indicates that the post-program performance differed significantly from the pre-program performance. This indicates that participation in the Pre-Kindergarten Program significantly increased children's understanding of basic concepts considered to be necessary for success in the primary grades.

Further evidence of the effects of the Pre-Kindergarten Program can be seen in a comparison between the posttest means of the Pre-Kindergarten and the 5 year old kindergarten children in the same school. Table 2 shows the means, sample size, and standard deviations for these two groups.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF PRE-KINDERGARTEN AND 5 YEAR OLD KINDERGARTEN POST-PROGRAM SCORES ON THE BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS

Group	N	Posttest Mean	S.D.	t-Ratio	p.
Pre-Kindergarten	27	42.78	4.26	7.06	.0005
5 Year Old Kindergarten	38	33.53	6.17		

A t-test for differences between two independent means was computed and the results are shown in Table 2. It is evident in Table 2 that the post-program scores of the Pre-Kindergarten and 5 year old kindergarten children differ significantly in favor of the Pre-Kindergarten. This indicates that the Pre-Kindergarten children demonstrated a greater knowledge of basic concepts at the end of the year than did the 5 year old kindergarten children. This trend toward the higher performance of the younger children was observed during the two preceeding years and further supports the extension of practices from the Pre-Kindergarten Program into the regular 5 year old kindergarten.

Students' Growth in Independence. Objectives 2 through 6 of the Pre-Kindergarten Program were (2) to develop children's independence in their care of self and personal property, (3) to improve participants' communication skills of speaking and listening,

(4) to develop participants' proficiency in manipulation and purposeful use of learning materials, (5) to stimulate growth of participants in perceptual and classificatory skills related to intellectual development, and (6) to enhance growth in social and emotional development. The New York University Growth in Independence Rating Scale which assesses pupil behaviors related to the areas of personal care, communication skills, manipulation of materials, intellectual development, and social-emotional development was used to measure progress toward objectives 2 through 6. In order to obtain a more representative assessment, all three staff members (the teacher, the educational assistant and the family worker) rated each child's behavior on the GIR Rating Scale during the first month of the program and again during the last month of the program. The pre- and post-program means, the difference scores and the F-ratios for the teacher's, educational assistant's and the family worker's ratings are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 shows that the differences between children's pre- and post program behavior as rated by the teacher, the educational assistant and the family worker were significant for each of the skill areas. It is clear that each of the staff members perceived marked changes in children's behavior on each of the dimensions

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF PRE-AND POST-PROGRAM RATINGS BY TEACHER, EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANT, AND FAMILY WORKER ON THE NYU GROWTH IN INDEPENDENCE RATING SCALE
(N=27)

Teacher				Educational Assistant				Family Worker			
Pre Mean	Post Mean	D	F-Ratio	Pre Mean	Post Mean	D	F-Ratio	Pre Mean	Post Mean	D	F-Ratio
Personal Care											
6.48	15.56	9.74	459.29	6.22	15.26	9.04	369.97	5.93	16.00	10.07	312.68
Communication Skills											
4.07	16.70	12.63	665.34	6.30	15.37	9.07	179.59	6.30	18.30	12.00	380.03
Manipulation of Materials											
5.37	18.41	13.04	487.07	7.00	15.30	8.30	237.28	7.22	18.93	11.70	507.08
Intellectual Development											
3.56	17.33	13.78	884.46	6.22	15.37	9.15	249.57	5.85	17.52	11.67	401.47
Social-Emotional Development											
5.37	17.30	11.93	567.77	8.59	16.89	8.30	147.48	8.22	19.67	11.44	382.04

*All F-ratios significant at beyond the .001 level assessed on the New York University Growth in Independence Rating Scale. It can be noted, however, that all but one of the F-ratios for the teacher's ratings are sizeably larger than those for the educational assistant or the family worker. This suggests that the addition of other raters did provide a more representative picture of the participants' behavior. Nonetheless, it is evident that the staff perceived the Pre-Kindergarten Program to be highly successful in developing the cognitive and social skills of participants.

In an effort to check the advisability of continued use of subjective ratings of pupil behavior as measures of progress, correlations between the staff ratings and the scores on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts were established. Results for three areas on the GIR Scale (communication skills, manipulation of materials, and intellectual development) most closely related to the areas assessed by the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts are shown in Table 4.

The six matrices presented in Table 4 indicate that correlations between staff ratings of pupil behavior in communication skills, manipulation of materials and intellectual development with the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts were much higher for the posttest than for the pretest. The correlations among the staff ratings on the GIR Scale appear to be fairly consistent with

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RATINGS BY STAFF ON THE NYU GROWTH IN INDEPENDENCE RATING SCALE AND THE BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS

		Communication Skills			Manipulation of Materials			Intellectual Development		
	Boehm	Teacher	Ed. Assist.	Family Worker	Teacher	Ed. Assist.	Family Worker	Teacher	Ed. Assist.	Family Worker
PRE-PROGRAM CORRELATIONS										
Boehm	1.00	.17	.28*	.30*	.22*	.43	.39	.32*	.38	.31*
Teacher		1.00	.62	.69	1.00	.44	.46	1.00	.68	.56
Ed. Assist.			1.00	.71		1.00	.62		1.00	.65
Family Worker				1.00			1.00			1.00
POST-PROGRAM CORRELATIONS										
Boehm	1.00	.56	.60	.70	.70	.66	.50	.59	.65	.70
Teacher		1.00	.49	.65	1.00	.57	.27*	1.00	.58	.65
Ed. Assist.			1.00	.60		1.00	.41		1.00	.63
Family Worker				1.00			1.00			1.00

*Not significant -- All other correlation coefficients are significant at $<.05$

some fluctuation in specific areas. These data suggest that staff observation and ratings are more appropriate at the end of a program than at the beginning. Thus, as suggested in previous evaluation reports, subjective rating scales are unreliable measures of growth, particularly,as Table 4 shows, pre-program ratings are less accurate.

It should be noted that the ratings by the two paraprofessionals fairly consistently correlated higher with the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts than did the teacher's ratings. This suggests the need for obtaining assessment of pupil behavior from staff working with children in a variety of roles in order to obtain a more accurate picture of the children's performance.

Parental Attitude and Involvement. The final objective of the Pre-Kindergarten Program was to increase the level of parental involvement and the positive nature of their attitudes. In order to assess the degree of attainment of this objective, the Parental Attitude and Involvement Scale (see Appendix B) was administered during the first and last month of the program. Table 5 shows the sample size, means and difference scores for the pre- and post-program administrations of the scale.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF PRE-AND POST-PROGRAM SCORES
FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND ATTITUDE

	N	Pre-Program Mean	Post-Program Mean	Mean Difference	t-Ratio
Involvement	14	9.71	20.64	10.93	6.32*
Attitude	14	28.36	34.43	6.07	5.14*

*$p < .0005$

A t-test for correlated data was performed and results are shown in Table 5. Scores for both the level of parental involvement and the positive nature of their attitudes increased significantly during the program. These data support the conclusion that the Pre-Kindergarten Program did achieve objective 7. The final question asked of parents was whether they would rather have their child attend a full day in a day care center than in the pre-kindergarten class. At the beginning of the year 11 parents agreed that they would rather have their child in a day care center whereas at the end of the year, only 2 parents stated this to be true. It is evident that the parents of participants believed that the program was a positive influence on their child.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Standardized testing results indicate that children in the Pre-Kindergarten Program significantly increased the level of their knowledge of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades.

2. Subjective ratings of pupil behavior indicate that children increased the level of independence in personal care, communication skills, manipulation of materials, intellectual skills and social and emotional skills.

3. A comparison between the post-program scores of the Pre-Kindergarten children and the 5 year old kindergarten

children show the Pre-Kindergarten scores to be significantly higher than the scores for the 5 year old kindergarten children. This indicates that the nature of the Pre-Kindergarten Program is effective for teaching children an understanding of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades. It is recommended that the Pre-Kindergarten program be examined and appropriately extended into the 5 year old kindergarten.

4. Staff ratings of pupil behavior are more reliable at the end of the year than they are at the beginning of the year and therefore are not trustworthy measures of pupil growth.

5. The program for involving parents and increasing the positive nature of their attitudes appeared to be successful.

6. It is recommended that the Pre-Kindergarten Program be continued.

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program objectives for the Strengthened Early Childhood Program were as follows:

1. To develop an understanding of the basic concepts of quantity, space and time needed for success in the primary grades.
2. To develop basic skills related to reading competence.
3. To develop basic math concepts and computation skills.
4. To screen children who may have special learning problems and provide guidance services in dealing with those problems.
5. To improve teachers' interactive skills toward providing a positive classroom atmosphere for developing independence and decision making among kindergarten children.
6. To expand the educational role of the paraprofessional, through training and experience, as complementary to the teacher and thus more effective in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program.
7. To increase (a) parental involvement in the child's educational program and to change (b) parental attitudes toward education.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The following evaluation objectives were designed to assess progress toward the program objectives:

1. Given the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts on a pre- post-program basis, students in the program, when compared to a control group, will show significantly greater understanding of basic concepts.

2. Given a pre- and post-test for assessing growth in appropriate grade level reading skills, the target population will manifest significantly greater gains in reading achievement when compared to a control group.

3. Given a pre- and post-test for assessing growth in math concepts and computational skills, students in the program will manifest significantly greater gains in math achievement when compared to a control group.

4. Given a checklist as a guide in identifying specific learning problems, children receiving guidance services will exhibit significantly fewer problems when rated on the checklist again at the end of the school year.

5. Given the Anderson Observational Instrument on a pre-post-training-program basis, kindergarten teachers will have significantly changed their behavior toward providing a classroom atmosphere which facilitates children's independence and participation in decision making.

6. Given a questionnaire asking for role description and participation in instruction, paraprofessionals in experimental classrooms will exhibit a significantly greater degree of involvement

in instructional activities than paraprofessionals in control classrooms.

7. Given a pre- post-program index of parental involvement and educational attitudes, parents of program participants will manifest demonstrable change in (a) involvement and (b) attitudes toward education.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The primary feature of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program in District 24 was instruction through the Distar Reading, Language and Math Programs. The Distar Programs were used in grades 1, 2 and 3 at P.S. 19 and in grades kindergarten, 1 and 2 at P.S. 143. The staff included teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, guidance counselors and principals. The process aspects of the program which were evaluated include the inservice training, program organization, facilities and materials, program operation, program effectiveness, parental attitude and involvement, and personnel support. Data were collected through questionnaires to teachers (see Appendix A), paraprofessionals (see Appendix B), coordinators (see Appendix C), principals (see Appendix D) and guidance counselors (see Appendix E). The summaries of the process evaluation appear in the following sections.

Inservice Training. The inservice training program developed by the coordinators focused on the implementation of the Distar Programs. Teachers and paraprofessionals who had not worked with Distar previously were given a two day workshop at the beginning of the year and continued training by the coordinators throughout the year. Consultants from the Distar Program were used to demonstrate techniques and to make recommendations about the use of the programs. Using a 1 to 5 scale ranging from unsatisfactory (1) to very satisfactory (5), the teachers and paraprofessionals rated the adequacy of the coverage of specific items related to the Distar Programs. The mean ratings of both groups appear in Table 1.

TABLE 1

RATINGS OF INSERVICE TRAINING

	Items	Teachers (N=17)	Paraprofessional (N=20)
1.	Objectives and rationale	2.9	4.1
2.	Basic premises of Distar	3.8	4.1
3.	Techniques of Distar	3.5	4.0
4.	Use of take homes	3.3	4.0
5.	Plans for grouping	2.8	4.0
6.	Procedures for evaluating	2.6	3.8
7.	Working with colleagues	3.1	4.4
8.	Records of progress	2.4	4.1
9.	Parent involvement	2.5	3.8
10.	Activities for children	2.1	3.9
11.	Voice and hand signals	3.5	4.1
12.	Skills in reading	3.0	4.4
13.	Skills in language	3.4	3.9
14.	Skills in math	3.2	4.1
15.	Supplementary learning activities	2.8	4.1
16.	Overall rating of inservice training	2.5	3.9

The means appearing in Table 1 show that the paraprofessionals rated the adequacy of the coverage in the inservice training program higher for each item than the teachers did. The higher ratings by paraprofessionals is a trend which can be observed throughout the process data and is established here in Table 1. The teachers rated activities for children not in Distar groups as the area least adequately covered and paraprofessionals rated techniques for parent involvement and procedures for evaluating progress as the areas they observed to be least adequately covered. The areas that teachers observed to be most adequately covered in the inservice training were the basic premises of Distar, techniques for using Distar and the voice and hand signals needed in Distar. The paraprofessionals rated the training in working with teachers and the sequence of reading skills as the most adequately covered aspects of the inservice training program. It is apparent in Table 1 that paraprofessionals rated all aspects of the inservice training program above average while teachers' ratings ranged from below average to slightly above average.

In addition to the teachers and paraprofessionals, the guidance counselor and princpals were asked to rate the inservice training provided. The guidance counselor rated the inservice training as 4.0 (above average) and the principals rated it as 4.5 (well above average to very satisfactory). It appears that participants in the inservice training program as well as observers found the program to be satisfactory.

Program Organization. The organization of the Distar Program was evaluated by teachers, paraprofessionals and coordinators for the reading, language and math programs separately and by the principals and the guidance counselor for all Distar Programs combined. The means of the ratings on the 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very satisfactory) scale by each rating group appear in Table 2.

The means presented in Table 2 show that the paraprofessionals rated the organization of the reading, language and math programs higher than the teachers rated them and the coordinators rated them higher than both the paraprofessionals and teachers did. It is also evident that all groups rated the organization of the reading program higher than they did the language or math programs. The organization of the math program was rated lowest by all groups combined.

The principals and the guidance counselor rated all aspects of the Distar Programs as well above average to very satisfactory. Their ratings compare most closely with those of the coordinators. The lowest group of ratings were given to the math program by the teachers who found the math program to be little more than barely satisfactory for nearly every aspect evaluated.

The overall evaluation of the Distar Program Organization shows that all rating groups found it to be average or above average. The principals, the coordinators and the guidance counselor found

TABLE 2

RATINGS OF PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

	Reading			Language			Math			All Distar Programs	
	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N-20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Principals N=2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Size of Classroom	3.8	3.3	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	2.7	2.8	5.0	4.5	4.0
Size of Instructional Groups	3.5	3.7	5.0	3.5	3.7	5.0	2.7	2.8	5.0	---	5.0
Number of Adults	3.4	4.0	4.0	3.1	3.8	4.0	2.8	3.8	4.0	4.5	5.0
Amount of Time Devoted	3.3	3.4	5.0	2.8	3.6	5.0	2.4	3.6	5.0	4.5	5.0
Procedures for Regrouping	3.1	3.1	4.0	2.8	3.4	4.0	2.4	3.7	4.0	---	---
Structure of Distar Program	3.4	2.0	5.0	2.6	3.9	5.0	2.5	2.5	5.0	---	4.0
Children's Knowledge of Routine	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5.0
Overall Rating of Program Organization	3.4	3.8	5.0	2.7	3.8	5.0	2.5	3.2	5.0	4.5	5.0
Mean of All Rating Groups	---	3.8	---	---	3.7	---	---	3.4	---	4.5	4.7

the program organization to be very satisfactory. The least satisfactory program organization was in math and the teachers rated all programs lower than any other rating group.

Facilities and Materials. The physical facilities and materials used in the Distar Programs were rated by the teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, principals and the guidance counselor. The summary of the ratings appears in Table 3. The means are based on the 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very satisfactory) rating scale used in the evaluation.

TABLE 3

RATINGS OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

Item	Tchr N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Princ N-2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Size of classroom	2.6	2.9	5.0	4.5	3.0
Physical facilities in room	2.4	3.0	3.0	4.5	3.0
Distar kits	3.7	4.4	5.0	5.0	---
Teachers guides	3.7	4.1	5.0	---	---
Instructional materials	3.7	4.4	5.0	---	---
Student materials	3.7	4.0	4.0	---	---
Supplementary materials	2.3	3.7	4.0	---	---
Collection of children's literature	3.0	3.7	2.0	4.0	---
Availability of materials at start	3.6	4.3	5.0	4.5	---
Quantity of Distar materials	---	---	---	5.0	---
Distribution of Distar materials	---	---	---	4.5	---
Safety & health factors in class	---	---	---	---	3.0
Stimulating lrning. environ.	--	---	---	---	5.0
Overall rating of facilities & materials	3.2	3.8	4.0	4.5	4.0

The means presented in Table 3 show that all rating groups found the physical facilities and the materials related to the program to be above average. The lowest ratings were given by the teachers and the highest ratings were given by the principals. It is evident that the staff involved in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program found the physical facilities and materials related to the Distar Programs to be above average.

Program Operation. The operation of the reading, language and math programs was evaluated by the teachers, paraprofessionals and the coordinators. The operation of all Distar Programs combined was evaluated by the principals and the guidance counselor. The 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very satisfactory) rating scale was used on each questionnaire and ratings were summarized to obtain the means presented in Table 4.

The means presented in Table 4 show that the operation of the reading program was rated as more satisfactory than the language or math programs. The ratings for the operation of the math program were lower than those for the reading or language programs. The coordinators rated the operation of the programs higher than the paraprofessionals and the teachers. The paraprofessionals rated the operation of the programs higher than the teachers. The principals and the guidance counselor rated the operation of all Distar Programs as well above average or very satisfactory.

TABLE 4

RATINGS OF PROGRAM OPERATION

	Reading			Language			Math			All Distar Programs	
	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Principals N=2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Management of Groups	3.5	4.1	5.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	2.8	4.1	5.0	4.5	5.0
Record Keeping	3.2	4.1	5.0	3.0	3.6	5.0	2.6	3.9	5.0	4.5	---
Sequence of Skills	3.8	3.7	5.0	3.0	3.9	5.0	2.6	4.1	4.0	---	---
Pacing of New Skills	3.6	4.1	5.0	2.9	3.7	5.0	2.4	3.8	5.0	---	---
Shared Teaching By Teachers & Paras.	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.5	4.0
Consideration of Children's Needs	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5.0
Overall Rating	3.6	4.1	5.0	3.0	3.9	5.0	2.5	3.9	5.0	4.5	5.0
Mean of All Rating Groups	---	4.2	---	---	4.0	---	---	3.8	---	4.5	4.8

It is evident that the operation of all Distar Programs was considered to be average, above average or very satisfactory by most rating groups. The single exception to this trend appeared in the teachers' rating of the operation of the math program. Voluntary comments on the questionnaires support the lower assessment of the content of the Distar Math Program. Comments which reflect the teachers' assessment of the math program were "math program leaves out many skills," "Pacing of math program is slow and very repetitious," "The math program did not cover enough areas of the math curriculum," and "The language and math programs are totally uninspiring." The pupil performance data for grades 1 and 2 presented later in this report support the teachers' assessment of the math program.

Program Effectiveness. The effectiveness of the reading, language and math programs was rated by teachers, paraprofessionals and coordinators. The effectiveness of all Distar Programs combined was rated by the principals and the guidance counselor. The 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very satisfactory) rating scale was used by each rating group. The summary of their ratings appear in Table 5.

The means shown in Table 5 indicate that the teachers, paraprofessionals and the coordinators judged the reading program to be more effective than the math or language programs. The trend to be more positive about the reading program than the other programs

TABLE 5

RATINGS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

	Reading			Language			Math			All Distar Programs	
	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Tchrs N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Principals N=2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Student Enthusiasm	3.5	4.0	5.0	2.5	3.4	3.0	2.7	3.8	4.0	5.0	5.0
Student Progress in Skills	4.1	4.2	5.0	3.0	3.6	4.0	2.7	4.2	5.0	---	4.0
Student Application of Skills	3.9	4.3	5.0	2.7	3.8	5.0	2.5	4.1	5.0	---	---
Student Independent Work	3.7	4.2	4.0	2.7	3.6	4.0	2.4	3.6	4.0	---	3.0
Student Progress in Phonics Skills	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.5	---
Student Progress in Reading Comprehension	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.5	---
Student Progress in Language Development				---	---	---	---	---	---	4.5	---
Student Progress in Math Skills				---	---	---	---	---	---	4.5	---
Student Ability to Function in Programs				---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3.5
Overall Rating	4.0	4.2	5.0	2.8	3.6	4.5	2.6	3.9	4.5	4.5	4.0
Mean of All Rating Groups	---	4.3	---	---	3.5	---	---	3.7	---	4.6	3.9

has been evident throughout the evaluation of the preceding aspects reported. A reversal of the ordering of the language and math program occurs in the judgment of program effectiveness from the order established in other aspects of the evaluation. In Table 5 it can be observed that the combined ratings of all groups show that these groups believe the math program to be more effective than the language program. The pupil performance data presented later in this report show no differences between the Distar and Non-Distar groups on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts used to assess the language program and only differences between Distar and Non-Distar groups on the Metropolitan Achievement Test math scores at the third grade. The math scores at the third grade do favor the Distar groups.

Teacher and paraprofessional comments which reveal the nature of their lower level of satisfaction for the language program were volunteered on several questionnaires. Some were as follows: "Much of the Distar II Language Program was too difficult for non-English speaking children," "The language program did not include topics and areas appropriate for first grade children," "My students can verbalize everything and understand nothing," "The language program is extremely boring."

The information presented in Table 5 indicates that the overall ratings by the teachers showed their judgment of the effectiveness of the reading program to be above average and their judgment of the language and math programs to be below average. The paraprofessionals judged the reading program to be more effective than either the language or math program, but judgments about the language and math programs were mixed. The coordinators concurred that the reading program was more effective than the language and math programs but believed the math program to be more effective than the language program. The principals and the guidance counselor judged the effectiveness of all the Distar Programs to be well above average.

Parental Attitude and Involvement. The teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, principals and the guidance counselor were asked to rate the extent of parental involvement with and their attitude toward the Distar Programs. The 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very staisfactory) rating scale was used to indicate their assessments. The means of the ratings by each group appears in Table 6.

TABLE 6

RATINGS OF PARENT ATTITUDE AND INVOLVEMENT

Item	Tchr N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Princ N=2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Parents' knowledge of program	1.8	3.5	5.0	3.0	5.0
Extent of involvement	1.6	3.0	4.0	2.5	5.0
Parents' attitude	2.1	3.5	5.0	3.0	5.0
Time for parent confs.	2.7	3.3	4.0	4.5	5.0
Parental cooperation with problems	---	---	---	---	4.0
Overall Rating	1.8	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0

The means shown in Table 6 indicate that most staff members judged parental attitude and involvement to be less satisfactory than other aspects of the program. The coordinators and the guidance counselor believed the parents' level of involvement and their attitude to be above average while other groups judged these aspects to be average or below average. The teachers judged parents' involvement and knowledge of the program to be barely satisfactory or less than barely satisfactory. Comments which were volunteered on the questionnaires indicated that many parents are very favorable toward the Distar Programs. The comments further indicated that parents who attended the workshops were very knowledgeable about Distar and generally very favorable. The summaries of the ratings presented here conceal the wide variation that exists among the level of parents' involvement and the nature of their attitudes. It should be noted that the information presented in this section of the report is based on staff assessments and not on actual tallies of parents' responses. The report of actual parent responses appears in the last section of the report under Program Effectiveness. The data reported there for assessment of objective seven indicates that the level of parental involvement did increase significantly during the year but the nature of their attitudes did not change significantly.

The results of the staff assessment of parental involvement and attitudes presented in Table 6 show that teachers, paraprofessionals and principals are not satisfied with the level of parental involvement in the program or with the general nature of attitudes expressed by parents.

Personnel Support. In order to determine the level of support from their colleagues the staff observed, a rating of personnel support was elicited from each group. The 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (very satisfactory) rating scale was used to indicate the level of support recognized. The summary of the results appears in Table 7.

TABLE 7

RATINGS OF PERSONNEL SUPPORT

Item	Tchr N=17	Para N=20	Coord N=2	Princ N=2	Guid. Couns. N=1
Principal's support	3.7	4.5	4.5	---	5.0
Helpfulness of BCL	2.8	4.5	4.5	5.0(1) 2.0(1)	2.0
Assistance from coordinators	3.8	4.5	---	5.0	5.0
Teachers' willingness	---	---	5.0	---	---
Help from guid. couns.	2.6	4.0	5.0(1) 0.0(1)	5.0(1) 2.0(1)	---
Para. willingness	---	---	5.0	---	---
Teacher attitude/para	---	---	---	4.0	---
Teacher cooperation in resolution of problem	---	---	4.5	---	4.0
Teacher use of para.	---	---	---	5.0	---
Overall rating	3.5	4.3	4.5	---	4.0

The means presented in Table 7 indicate a generally high level of satisfaction among the staff in relation to personnel support. Nearly all ratings of the support from colleagues observed by the various staff groups were well above average. The few exceptions which can be seen by lower ratings in Table 7 were due to inappropriate assignments, staff absences or illnesses and staff changes during the year. These events resulted in less than satisfactory ratings for specific roles in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program. The principals, the coordinators, one Bilingual Community Liaison and one guidance counselor received very satisfactory ratings from their colleagues.

Overall Ratings of Programs. The final section of the staff evaluation report deals with a comparison between the Strengthened Early Childhood Program of 1972-73 and that of 1971-72. Teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, principals and the guidance counselor were asked if they participated in a similar program last year, how this year's program compared with last year's, and whether they would choose to participate in a similar program next year. The answers to these questions appear in Table 8.

The frequencies presented in Table 8 show a majority of the staff has now had two year's experience in the Distar Programs. It further shows that a majority of the staff wants to participate in a similar program next year. It must be noted that several respondents qualified their answers by saying they wanted to use only the Distar Reading Program next year. There were 28 staff members who had participated in the 1971-72 program; 17 of these believed the 1972-73 program to be superior to that year and 11 believed it to be the same. No one regarded this year's program as inferior to the prior program.

TABLE 8

STAFF COMPARISONS BETWEEN 1971-72 AND 1972-73 PROGRAMS AND INTEREST IN 1973-74 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

	Tea[illegible]s N[illegible]7		Para. N=20		Coords. N=2		Principals N=2		Guid. Couns. N=1	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Did you participate last year?	11	6	13	7	2	0	2	0	0	1
2. Are you interested in parti. next year?	12	5	17	3	2	0	2	0	1	0
3. How did this year's program compare with last year?	5=Superior 6=Same 0=Inferior		8=Superior 5=Same 0=Inferior		2=Superior 0=Same 0=Inferior		2=Superior 0=Same 0=Inferior		(No basis for rating)	

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

__Students' Understanding of Basic Concepts__. The first objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to develop students' understanding of the basic concepts of time, space and quantity considered to be necessary for success in the primary grades. Progress toward this goal was assessed by measuring students' pre-and post-program performances on the __Boehm Test of Basic Concepts__. An analysis of covariance was performed on the pre-test and post-test scores of kindergarten, first and second grade children in experimental (Distar) and control (Non-Distar) groups. The results of those analyses are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-PROGRAM SCORES ON THE __BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS__ FOR KINDERGARTEN, GRADES 1 AND 2

Group	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Adjusted Post Mean	df	F-ratio	p
__Kindergarten__							
Experimental (Distar)	38	26.92	33.53	32.87	1/99	2.38	NS
Control (Non-Distar)	64	25.20	34.02	34.40			
__First Grade__							
Experimental (Distar)	141	31.06	38.91	39.61	1/219	.55	NS
Control (Non-Distar)	81	35.07	40.33	39.12			
__Second Grade__							
Experimental (Distar)	137	42.02	44.77	44.70	1/222	1.47	NS
Control (Non-Distar)	88	41.55	45.06	45.16			

The F-ratios presented in Table 9 indicate that there were no differences between the performance of the experimental (Distar) groups and the control (Non-Distar) groups. The Distar Language Program is the part of the experimental program most closely related to the concepts assessed in the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts. Therefore, it can be concluded that objective one was not met; the students in the experimental program did not show significantly greater understanding of basic concepts than a comparable group of students not exposed to the experimental program.

Students' Reading Achievement. The second objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to develop reading skills appropriate to each grade level. Assessment instruments were selected that were suitable for children at each grade level. The kindergarten students' progress was measured at the beginning and end of the program with the New York City Pre Reading Assessment. First grade students were given the New York City Pre Reading Assessment at the beginning of the year and the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary I at the end of the year. Second grade students were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary I at the beginning and end of the program and third grade students were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary II at the beginning and end of the program. The results for each grade level are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF KINDERGARTEN PRE- AND POST-PROGRAM SCORES ON THE NEW YORK CITY PRE READING ASSESSMENT

Group	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Adjusted Post Mean	df	F-ratio	p
Language							
Experimental (Distar) P.S. 143	38	18.53	26.16	27.38	1/99	5.39	.05
Control (Non-Distar) P.S. 19	64	23.17	25.16	25.43			
Visual Discrimination							
Experimental (Distar) P.S. 143	36	11.47	20.06	21.40	1/97	5.17	.05
Control (Non-Distar) P.S. 19	64	16.31	20.05	19.29			

The analysis of covariance performed on the kindergarten students' scores resulted in F-ratios that were significant for both the language and visual discrimination subtests of the New York City Pre Reading Assessment. This indicates that the objective to develop basic reading skills was achieved for the kindergarten students in the experimental program (Distar). It should be noted that in the 1971-72 evaluation report, both P.S. 19 and P.S. 143 students were given the Distar Reading Program. In the comparison of those programs, kindergarten students at P.S. 19 outstripped the performance of students at P.S. 143 significantly. During the current year, P.S. 19 dropped the Distar Reading Program in the kindergarten and served as the control group for P.S. 143. As shown in Table 10, the Distar groups at P.S. 143 made significantly greater gains than the Non-Distar groups at P.S. 19. It must therefore be concluded that the Distar Reading Program was used successfully to develop the basic reading skills at the kindergarten level.

The Distar Reading Program was used in the first grades at both P.S. 19 and P.S. 143. In order to compare the progress of students in the experimental program with students in a regular program, a control group was obtained at P.S. 81. The results of the first grade comparisons are shown in Table 11. For this comparison, the *New York City Pre Reading Assessment*, language subtest, was used as the covariate with the *Metropolitan Achievement Test*, Primary I used for the post-test scores.

The results of the analysis of covariance presented in Table 11 show that the F-ratios are significant for two of the subtests on the *Metropolitan Achievement Test*, Primary I, as well as for the total reading score. The differences between the Distar and Non-Distar groups were not significant for the word knowledge subtest. It can be concluded, therefore, that the reading objective for the first grade students in the Distar Program was met, with the exception of one subtest. The Distar groups achieved significantly higher grade equivalent post-program scores than Non-Distar groups in word analysis, reading and total reading.

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR FIRST GRADE ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST USING THE NEW YORK CITY PRE-READING ASSESSMENT SCORE AS THE COVARIATE

Metropolitan Reading	N	Covar. Lang.	Post	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Word Knowledge							
Exper. (Distar)	140	25.01	1.99	2.00	1/218	3.72	NS
Cont. (Non-Distar)	81	26.30	1.88	1.84			
Word Analysis							
Exper. (Distar)	140	25.01	1.83	1.85	1/217	14.19	.01
Cont. (Non-Distar)	80	26.48	1.64	1.61			
Reading							
Exper. (Distar)	140	15.08	1.76	1.78	1/218	10.75	.01
Cont. (Non-Distar)	81	26.30	1.54	1.51			
Total Reading							
Exper. (Distar)	141	25.01	1.89	1.91	1/219	8.13	.01
Cont. (Non-Distar)	81	26.30	1.72	1.69			

The Distar Reading Program was implemented in the second grades at both P.S. 19 and P.S. 143. In order to compare the progress of second graders using Distar with second graders in a regular reading porgram, a control group was obtained from P.S. 81. The raw scores from the pre-test and post-test on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were converted into grade equivalents. The grade equivalent comparison was made by an analysis of covariance and the results are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR SECOND GRADE STUDENTS ON THE *METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST*

		Grade Equivalents					
Group	N	Pre Test	Post Test	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Word Knowledge							
Exper. (Distar)	137	1.65	2.61	2.63	1/222	12.40	.01
Cont. (Non-Dis.)	88	1.74	2.30	2.27			
Word Analysis							
Exper. (Distar)	137	1.67	2.28	2.26	1/220	0.31	NS
Cont. (Non-Dis.)	86	1.59	2.18	2.22			
Reading							
Exper. (Distar)	136	1.49	2.68	2.72	1/221	20.77	.01
Cont. (Non-Dis.)	86	1.62	2.33	2.25			
Total Reading							
Exper. (Distar)	137	1.58	2.63	2.69	1/222	33.86	.01
Cont. (Non-Dis.)	88	1.70	2.28	2.19			

The analysis of covariance for the second grade scores resulted in F-ratios that were significant for two of the subtests and for the total reading score on the *Metropolitan Achievement Test*. The Distar and Non-Distar groups did not differ significantly on the word analysis subtest. It can be noted that only in the word analysis section of the *Metropolitan Achievement Test* did the experimental group have a pre-test mean higher than the control group. In both other subtests and the total reading score the experimental groups started the year at a lower level of performance than the control groups.

The post-test means for the experimental groups exceeded those of the control groups in each subtest score, however, the difference was not significant for the word analysis subtest. These data support the conclusion that the Distar Reading Program was used successfully in the second grade to achieve the reading objective proposed for the program. The Distar groups gained significantly more than Non-Distar groups in word knowledge, reading and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

The Distar Reading Program was used in the third grades only at P.S. 19, therefore, the controls used to compare Distar and Non-Distar groups were selected from P.S. 143. The results of the analysis of covariance using the grade equivalent scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary II are presented in Table 13.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES FOR THIRD GRADE STUDENTS ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Group		N	Pre Test	Post Test	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Word Knowledge								
Exper.	PS 19	67	2.09	4.03	4.36	1/112	38.24	.01
Cont.	PS143	48	2.52	3.53	3.07			
Word Analysis								
Exper.	PS 19	67	2.34	3.68	3.73	1/112	14.59	.01
Cont.	PS143	48	2.44	3.29	3.22			
Reading								
Exper.	PS 19	67	1.88	3.44	3.58	1/116	28.77	.01
Cont.	PS143	52	2.25	3.02	2.84			
Total Reading								
Exper.	PS 19	67	1.97	3.61	3.80	1/116	32.47	.01
Cont.	PS143	52	2.35	3.23	2.98			

The F-ratios obtained in the analysis of covariance for the third grade were significant at the .01 level for each subtest as well as total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary II. In each of the subtests, the Distar groups started the year at a lower performance level than the Non-Distar groups. By the end of the year, however, the Distar groups' performance exceeded that of the Non-Distar groups in all areas of reading. It can be concluded from these data, therefore, that the Distar Reading Program was implemented successully at the third grade so that the reading objective was achieved. Distar groups at the third grade achieved significantly more than Non-Distar groups on word knowledge, word analysis, reading and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary II.

Students' Math Achievement. The third objective for the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to develop basic math concepts and computation skills. The measuring instrument used to assess progress toward the math objective was the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary I and Primary II. Since first and second grade students at P.S. 19 and P.S. 143 both received Distar Math, the controls for the first and second grades were obtained at P.S. 81.

The Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary I, was inappropriate to use with first graders at the beginning of the year so the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts scores were used as the covariate scores. The results of the analysis of covariance for the first grade math scores appear in Table 14.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR
FIRST GRADE STUDENTS' MATH GAINS ON
THE *METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST*

Group	N	Boehm Covar.	Post Test	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Computation							
Exper.(Dis.)	133	31.42	9.81*	10.07*	1/209	3.99	.05
Cont. (Non-D)	79	34.94	11.84*	11.39*			
Concepts							
Exper.(Dis.)	141	31.06	16.45*	16.77*	1/219	11.70	.01
Cont.(Non-D)	81	35.07	19.73*	19.16*			
Total Math							
Exper.(Dis.)	141	31.06	1.34	1.36	1/219	9.84	.01
Cont.(Non-D)	81	35.07	1.52	1.48			

*Raw score

The results seen in Table 14 show that the F-ratios for the subtests on computation and on concepts as well as the total math scores were significant. The direction of the difference, however, was in favor of the control or Non-Distar groups. This indicates that the Distar Math Program was not as effective as the regular math program in contributing to pupil progress in math. It must be concluded, therefore, that the math objective for grade 1 was not achieved.

The *Metropolitan Achievement Test*, Primary I, was used to measure progress in math at the second grade level. The results of the analysis of covariance are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR SECOND GRADE MATH GAINS ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Group	N	Pre Test	Post Test	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Computation							
Exper. (Distar)	137	10.62*	17.85*	17.92*	1/222	47.01	.01
Cont. (Non-D.)	88	10.94*	21.55*	21.45*			
Concepts							
Exper. (Distar)	137	17.79*	25.25*	25.73*	1/222	0.65	NS
Cont. (Non-D.)	88	20.70*	27.01*	26.26*			
Total Math							
Exper. (Distar)	137	1.44	2.14	2.18	1/222	5.34	.05
Cont. (Non-D.)	88	1.52	2.38	2.32			

*Raw Score

The results shown in Table 15 indicate that the F-ratios for the computation and total math scores were significant. The F-ratio for the concepts subtest was not significant. The differences were in favor of the control groups who did not receive the Distar Math Program, however, This indicates that the experimental Distar Math Program was not as effective in promoting pupil growth in math as the regular math program. Therefore, it must be concluded that the math objective for the second grade was not achieved.

Progress in math at the third grade was measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary II. The experimental Distar Math Program was implemented only at P.S. 19, so students in a regular math program at P.S. 143 were used as control groups. The pre- and post-program scores for the Distar and Non-Distar groups were compared by an analysis of covariance. The results are presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR MATH GAINS ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Group	N	Pre Test	Post Test	Adj. Post	df	F-ratio	p
Computation							
Exper. PS 19	64	2.29	3.52	3.76	1/112	.91	NS
Cont. PS 143	51	2.67	3.92	3.62			
Concepts							
Exper. PS 19	64	2.14	3.91	4.07	1/112	8.57	.01
Cont. PS 143	51	2.42	3.75	3.54			
Problem Solving							
Exper. PS 19	63	2.42	3.53	3.58	1/110	.76	NS
Cont. PS 143	50	2.53	3.52	3.45			
Total Math							
Exper. PS 19	64	2.19	3.61	3.81	1/112	6.96	.01
Cont. PS 143	51	2.47	3.69	3.45			

The F-ratios in Table 16 show that differences between the scores were significant for the subtest on concepts and for the total math scores but not significant for the subtests on computation and problem solving. The differences that were revealed favor the experimental Distar groups. These data show that the math objective for the third grades was partially achieved. The Distar groups achieved significantly more in math concepts and total math than Non-Distar groups.

In order to determine whether the experimental program had an effect on students which was more beneficial than previous programs of instruction they had received, the historical rate of growth method of analysis was performed. Since kindergarten and first grade children had not established an historical rate of growth, the analysis was performed on second and third grade data only. The results of the historical rate of growth analysis appear in Table 17.

It is evident from the t-ratios in Table 17 that students in the second and third grades in both the experimental Distar classes and the control Non-Distar classes exceeded the post-test scores anticipated for them. It can also be seen that the gains above those anticipated from previous performances, were greater for the Distar classes in all areas except math at the second grade. In second grade math, the control group gains which were above those anticipated were larger than the gains of the experimental group. The gains above those anticipated were larger for the Distar classes in reading at the second grade and in both reading and math at the third grade than they were for the Non-Distar classes. It can be concluded, therefore, that the Distar Reading Program contributed to a higher level of achievement from children in the second and third grades and the Distar Math Program contributed to a higher level of achievement from children in the third grade than the regular programs.

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF SECOND AND THIRD GRADES ACTUAL AND ANTICIPATED GAINS USING THE HISTORICAL RATE METHOD WITH GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES IN READING AND MATH

		Pre Test		Antic. Post Test		Actual Post Test		Actual	Gain Above	t-	
	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Gain	Anticipated	Ratio	p
						Grade Two					
Experimental	137										
Total Reading		1.58	.38	1.90	.59	2.63	.86	1.05	.73	11.87	.0005
Total Math		1.44	.39	1.68	.61	2.14	.69	0.70	.46	10.90	.0005
Control	88										
Total Reading		1.70	.26	2.06	.40	2.28	.53	0.58	.22	4.84	.0005
Total Math		1.52	.35	1.79	.53	2.38	.47	0.86	.58	11.16	.0005
						Grade Three					
Experimental	67										
Total Reading		1.97	.48	2.23	.62	3.61	1.07	1.64	1.38	13.13	.0005
Total Math		2.19	.43	2.52	.55	3.61	0.93	1.42	1.09	13.42	.0005
Control	64										
Total Reading		2.35	.69	2.73	.88	3.23	0.89	.88	.50	6.46	.0005
Total Math		2.47	.66	2.88	.85	3.68	1.28	1.21	.88	7.43	.0005

Guidance Services For Learning Problems. The fourth objective for the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to screen children who may have special learning problems and to provide guidance services in dealing with these problems. In order to assess progress toward this objective, teachers were asked to complete an SEC Behavioral Checklist (see Appendix F) for each child referred to the Guidance Counselor. The SEC Behavioral Checklist completed when a child was referred to the Guidance Counselor was used as the pre-test measure of a child's academic rating and summary of his behavior problems and the SEC Behavioral Checklist completed at the end of the year was used as the post-test. A desirable change in a child's academic ratings would be reflected in an increase in his academic scores while a desirable change in his behavior rating would be reflected in a decrease in the number of behavior problems observed. It was not possible to obtain guidance records from P.S. 19, so no data appear here for that part of the program. The results for students at P.S. 143 appear in Table 18.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-PROGRAM ACADEMIC RATINGS AND BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS OF STUDENTS RECEIVING GUIDANCE SERVICES AT P.S. 143

	N	Pre Test	Post Post	D	t	p
Academic Problems	65	7.31	10.95	3.65	9.68	.01
Behavior Problems	65	30.22	18.65	11.57	9.81	.01

The t-ratios in Table 18 show that children who received guidance services made a significant increase in their academic ratings and a significant decrease in the number of behavior problems teachers observed. The direction of the changes was favorable for each area of performance. Further evidence of the effects of the guidance services at P.S. 143 was recorded on the SEC Behavioral Checklist submitted for the evaluation. The dates of contacts with students, parents and referral agencies and notes about the nature of the problems indicated a thorough program directed toward the resolution of children's behavior problems.

The results of the evaluation of the guidance services at P.S. 143 show that children receiving guidance services significantly increased in the academic ratings made by their teachers. Furthermore, the data show that children receiving guidance services significantly decreased the number of behavior problems observed by their teachers. It can, therefore, be concluded that the objective to screen children with special learning problems and to implement a program to help resolve the learning problems was achieved at P.S. 143. There are no records to suggest that a similar program was implemented at P.S. 19 although the same evaluation plan was initiated. Staff changes and irregular attendance prevented the successful completion of the evaluation of the guidance services at P.S. 19.

Teachers' Interactive Skills. The fifth objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to improve teachers' interactive skills toward providing a positive classroom atmosphere for developing independence and decision making among kindergarten children. In order to assess progress toward this objective, the kindergarten teachers were video taped before and after training in self analysis using the Anderson Observational Instrument (see Appendix G). The teachers estimated the amount of controlling (dominative) behavior and the amount of integrative behavior they exhibited prior to receiving training in the use of the Anderson Observational Instrument (see Teacher Estimation Form in Appendix H). Following the training, each teacher again rated her own video tape on the Anderson instrument. The categories of the Anderson Observational Instrument represent a continuum of teacher behavior from integrative to dominative. Integrative behavior is facilitative of children's initiative, responsibility and decision making.

Dominative behavior is teacher directed behavior in which the teacher imposes her decisions on children, that is she tells rather than asks.

The teachers' scores on the Anderson Observational Instrument were computed into an I/D ratio (Integrative/Dominative) and subsequently into a percentage of integrativeness. The larger the percentage the more integrative the score. The differences between the teachers' initial estimates and their final estimates are shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-TRAINING RATINGS
OF KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS ON USE OF
DOMINATIVE/INTEGRATIVE BEHAVIOR

		Teachers' Mean Ratings			
Group	N	Initial Estimate	Final Estimate	t-ratio	p
Kindergarten Teachers	7	2.88	1.45	2.07	.05

df=6

In Table 19 it can be seen that the teachers' final estimate of their integrativeness was significantly lower after they received the training than it was initially. The teachers became more aware of their controlling behavior and rated the percent of their integrative behavior lower. The t-ratio of 2.07 is significant at the .05 level.

In order to see whether the teachers' ratings of their video tapes differed significantly from more objective ratings of the estimate of the dominative/integrative behavior, their video tapes were rated by a panel of trained judges. The results of the comparison of ratings are shown in Table 20.

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' AND JUDGES' RATINGS OF TEACHERS' INTEGRATIVE/DOMINATIVE BEHAVIOR

Mean Ratings of Video Tapes			
Teachers	Panel of Judges	t	p
.68	.36	1.6	NS

df=12

It is apparent in Table 20 that the ratings by the panel of judges did not differ significantly from the teachers' ratings of their own video tapes. This suggests that the teachers were objective in analyzing their own video tapes. From these data it can be concluded that (1) teachers who receive training in analysis of their dominative/integrative behavior become significantly more aware of the percent of integrativeness, and (2) the teachers who received training did not differ significantly from a panel of trained judges in the ratings of their dominative/integrative behavior. This preliminary pilot program suggests that video taping and guided self analysis can be used to improve teachers' awareness of their controlling behavior as a step toward improving classroom atmosphere for developing independence and decision making among children. Although the program was tried only at the kindergarten level, it could be used at other grade levels.

Expanding the Educational Role of the Paraprofessional. The sixth objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to expand the educational role of the paraprofessional. The evaluation plan envisioned was to compare the functions of paraprofessionals in Distar classrooms with those of paraprofessionals in Non-Distar classrooms. It was impossible to carry out the evaluation plans as devised since all paraprofessionals in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program participated in the Distar Programs. Some paraprofessionals were assigned to a Distar classroom full time while others were trained to serve as a floating cluster of Distar instructors. In order to describe the role of the paraprofessionals and to determine the assessment of services provided by the paraprofessionals, items were included on the questionnaires to teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, principals and guidance counselors to elicit necessary information. All 20 paraprofessionals responding to the questionnaires reported teaching Distar groups. Fifteen teachers reported full time instruction in Distar groups by paraprofessionals while only one mentioned clerical tasks and four listed supervising, tutoring and remedial work with students as functions of the paraprofessionals.

It should be noted that the two teachers who omitted listing the instructional role of the paraprofessionals were teachers paired with a regular ratio teacher and therefore did not receive assistance from a paraprofessional.

The assessment of the paraprofessionals' services were obtained from teachers', coordinators', principals' and the guidance counselors' ratings on the questionnaires used in the Description of the Program section. The rating scale attributed 1=unsatisfactory, 2=barely satisfactory, 3=average, 4=above average and 5=very satisfactory. The summary of the mean ratings from the staff groups appear in Table 21.

TABLE 21

RATINGS OF PARAPROFESSIONAL SKILLS AND SERVICES

	Teachers N=17	Coordinator N=2	Principal N=2	Guidance Counselor N=1
1. Adequacy of paraprofessionals' preparation and skills	3.5	4.5	---	---
2. Overall rating of services provided by paraprofessional	3.5	5.0	---	---
3. Shared teaching by teacher and paraprofessional	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0

The means of the ratings of the paraprofessionals'services seen in Table 21 are all above average. The teachers' assessments of the services provided were lowest at 3.5 (slightly above average), while the other rating groups evaluated them as above average to very satisfactory. These data suggest that the majority of the professional staff considered the services of the paraprofessionals to be valuable and a necessary part of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program.

Based on information reported by teachers, paraprofessionals, coordinators, principals and the guidance counselor, it can be concluded that the paraprofessionals in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program were fully involved in an instructional role and their services were judged to be above average.

The paraprofessionals were asked to list any languages they speak in addition to English. Eleven reported that they spoke no language in addition to English, seven reported they spoke Spanish, one reported she spoke Greek, and one reported she spoke French and Spanish. It appears that a slight increase in the number of bilingual paraprofessionals has occurred since the 1971-72 evaluation.

Parental Attitudes and Involvement. The final objective of the Strengthened Early Childhood Program was to increase the level of parental involvement and to improve the positive nature of parents' attitude toward the schools. In order to measure possible changes in parents' level of involvement or changes in their attitudes toward schools, the Parental Attitude and Involvement Scale was administered at the beginning and end of the program (see Appendices I and J). The frequency of parental contacts with the school was assessed for Spanish and English speaking parents and converted to the percent responding at each level. The percentages are reported in Table 22.

It can be noted in Table 22 that the percentages reporting a higher level of involvement with the school increased during the year for both Spanish and English speaking parents. It is also evident that Spanish speaking parents had a higher level of involvement than English speaking parents generally. The only exception to this trend was in talking with the school principal and in knowing what one's child does in his class. For these two questions, the English speaking parents' level of response equalled or exceeded the level of response given by Spanish speaking parents.

The data in Table 22 show that the level of parental contact with the teacher is generally high, however, there are 17 percent of the Spanish speaking parents and 13 percent of the English speaking parents who had not discussed their child's progress with the teacher at the end of the year. Furthermore,

TABLE 22

LEVEL OF SPANISH AND ENGLISH SPEAKING PARENTS' INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES - PERCENTAGE DATA

Spanish								English							
Pre (N=95)				Post (N=127)				Pre (N=137)				Post (N=156)			
# of No Resp.	Not at All 1	Some what 2	Quite a lot 3	# of No Resp.	Not at All 1	Some what 2	Quite a lot 3	# of No Resp.	Not at All 1	Some what 2	Quite a lot 3	# of No Resp.	Not at All 1	Some what 2	Quite a lot 3
Have you discussed your child's progress with the teacher?															
(4)	47	41	12	(7)	17	64	19	(2)	47	36	17	(3)	13	49	38
Have you attended parent meetings at the school?															
(2)	43	44	13	(1)	21	53	26	(1)	57	29	14	(3)	42	39	19
Have you attended programs in which the children participated?															
(2)	55	32	13	(6)	34	46	20	(1)	60	24	16	(7)	54	26	20
Have you talked with the educational assistant?															
(2)	70	21	9	(3)	47	38	15	(4)	68	22	10	(6)	57	24	19
Have you observed the program in your child's class?															
(2)	47	39	14	(5)	25	43	32	(2)	59	27	14	(8)	38	41	21
Have you talked with the school principal or the assistant principal?															
(7)	80	9	11	(13)	67	22	11	(5)	67	22	11	(19)	63	19	18
Do you know what your child does in his class at school?															
(7)	27	34	39	(7)	8	31	62	(7)	13	47	40	(6)	4	33	63

there were nearly 50 percent (47 percent of Spanish and 57 percent of English) who had not talked with the educational assistant during the year. These data reveal a continuation of a trend noted in prior evaluation reports that educational assistants are not included in parent-teacher conferences. Although the involvement of paraprofessionals in the instructional role appears to have increased, it does not appear that they are involved to a greater degree in contacts with parents.

The positive nature of parents' attitudes toward the school was measured by their responses to the items on the attitude scale dealing with their belief that they could change the schools and teachers' willingness to see parents. The rating scale was such that a high score indicated a more positive attitude than a low score (1=negative attitude to 5=positive attitude). The responses were tallied and analyzed to obtain the differences between their attitudes at the beginning of the year and the end of the year. These data plus the analysis of the involvement scores for Spanish speaking and English speaking parents appear in Table 23.

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF PRE-AND POST-PROGRAM MEAN SCORES
FOR PARENTAL ATTITUDE AND INVOLVEMENT

	Pre-Program			Post-Program					
Spanish Parents	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Diff.	z-Score	p
Involvement	94	11.04	3.66	127	13.09	3.20	+2.05	4.33	.01
Attitude	87	7.67	7.71	113	6.83	2.31	-0.84	1.61	NS

English Parents	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	Diff.	z-Score	p
Involvement	137	11.34	3.53	155	12.75	3.74	+1.41	3.33	.01
Attitude	134	8.19	6.32	152	7.89	1.63	-0.30	0.53	NS

The z-scores shown in Table 23 indicate that there was a significant change in the level of involvement for both Spanish speaking and English speaking parents during the year but that there was not a significant change in their attitudes. The difference scores for attitudes show that the direction of change was toward a more negative attitude toward the schools, although the extent of the change was not statistically significant. These results suggest that the schools can increase the level of parental involvement without increasing the positive nature of parents' attitudes toward the schools.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. The process data showed that paraprofessionals rated all aspects of the program higher than the teachers did.

2. The Distar Reading Program was rated higher by SEC staff than the Distar Language and Math Programs.

3. The SEC staff rated the level of parental involvement lower than other aspects of the program.

4. The level of personnel support, as viewed by the SEC staff, is well above average.

5. The majority of the SEC staff found the 1972-73 program to be superior to the 1971-72 program and want to participate in a similar program next year.

6. Objective one, to develop students' understanding of basic concepts necessary for success in the primary grades, was not achieved. The Distar Language Program did not produce significantly higher scores for children in the program than comparable children achieved in a regular program.

7. Objective two, to develop basic reading skills, was achieved for kindergarten, grades 1, 2 and 3. Students in the Distar Reading Program achieved significantly more in reading than comparable students in a regular program.

8. Objective three, to develop basic math concepts and computation skills was not achieved in grades 1 and 2, but was

achieved for grade 3. Students in the Distar Math Program in grades 1 and 2 gained significantly less in math concepts and computation skills than comparable students in a regular program. Students in the Distar Math Program in the third grade gained significantly more in math concepts and computation skills than comparable students in a regular program.

9. Using the historical rate of growth method to analyze students' current performance compared to their previous performance, students in the control and experimental second and third grades made significantly greater gains in reading and math than those anticipated for them. Students in the experimental groups in the second grade did not make higher gains above anticipated in math than students in a regular second grade program. Students in the experimental groups in the third grade made higher gains above those anticipated in math than students in a regular third grade program. Students in the experimental groups in the second and third grades made higher gains above those anticipated in reading than students in regular second and third grade programs.

10. Students who received guidance services at P.S. 143 made a significant increase in teachers' ratings of their academic performance and a significant decrease in teachers' ratings of their behavior problems.

11. Kindergarten teachers who received training in the analysis of classroom atmosphere became significantly more aware of their dominative and integrative behavior.

12. Paraprofessionals are involved in a full teaching role in the Distar Programs. SEC staff associated with paraprofessionals view their services as above average. Nine of the 20 paraprofessionals are bilingual.

13. The level of parental involvement increased significantly during the school year, but the nature of parents' attitudes did not change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Distar Reading Program should be continued and refined. Teacher preference for using the Distar Reading Program should be considered in selecting staff for the program.

2. The Distar Language Program should be discontinued. The content of the program does not appear to meet the language needs of the population in District 24.

3. The Distar Math Program should be continued at the third grade level. The Distar Math Program at grades 1 and 2 should be discontinued. The math program used in the control school should be examined for possible use in the experimental schools.

4. Guidance services of the type provided at P.S. 143 should be continued and expanded. A guidance program must be initiated and evaluated at P.S. 19.

5. Use of video tape analysis for training teachers to become aware of their dominative and integrative behavior should be continued and expanded.

6. Paraprofessionals appear to be a vital part of the SEC program. Use of their services should be increased and their training continued. The addition of more bilingual paraprofessionals should continue.

7. The program for parental involvement should be continued and expanded. A program of parent education to increase the positive nature of parents' attitudes is warranted.

BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program objectives for the Bilingual Community Liaison (BCL) were as follows:

1. To develop positive relationships among community members, parents and school personnel and to promote positive attitudes toward education.

2. To improve the academic performance of non-English speaking children.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In order to assess progress in the accomplishment of the program objectives, the following evaluation objectives were developed:

1. Given a Spanish version of the Parental Attitude and Involvement Scale (see Appendix A) on a pre- and post-program basis, Spanish speaking parents will show a significant increase in the level of involvement in school related activities and in the positive nature of their attitudes toward education.

2. Given a pre-test and post-test of academic performance (basic concepts, reading and math), non-English speaking children whose families have direct contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison will perform significantly better than non-English speaking children whose families do not have direct contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The Bilingual Community Liaison Program functioned in P.S. 19 and P.S. 143 during the 1972-73 academic year. The two staff members who filled the BCL role were fluent speakers of Spanish which is the dominant second language in both school communities. The BCL worked directly with students, teachers, parents, guidance counselors, administrative staff and community agency staffs. The BCL frequently served as a translator during parent conferences, parent meetings and home visits. In addition, the BCL translated notices and correspondence sent to the homes of Spanish speaking students and taught a class in Spanish to teachers in the school.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Contacts With Spanish Speaking Parents. The first objective of the Bilingual Community Liaison Program was to develop positive relationships among community members, parents and school personnel and to promote positive attitudes toward education. This program objective was assessed by administering a Spanish version of the Parental Attitude and Involvement Scale to Spanish speaking parents during the first and last months of the program. The results of that survey are presented here.

The Spanish speaking parents' report of the level of contacts with the BCL and their ratings of the BCL services are

TABLE 1

SPANISH PARENTS' LEVEL OF CONTACT WITH AND RATINGS OF THE BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON (PERCENTAGE DATA)

ITEM	PRE-PROGRAM (N=1[illegible]6)				POST-PROGRAM (N=209)			
	No Re-sponse	Not At All	Some	Quite a Lot	No Re-sponse	Not At All	Some	Quite a Lot
Contacts with BCL								
1. Have you met the BCL?	0	74	15	11	0	35	41	24
2. Have you discussed your child's progress with the BCL?	1	78	12	9	0	42	44	14
3. Have you discussed school-related problems with the BCL?	2	82	8	8	3	44	38	15
4. Have you discussed non-school related problems with the BCL? (jobs, housing, health services, etc.)	3	88	4	5	5	54	31	10
5. Has the BCL participated by serving as a translator in conferences with other school personnel?	10	70	11	9	3	38	15	44
Rating of BCL's Services								
1. How satisfied are you with the services the BCL gave you?	Very Satisfied Satisfied Not Satisfied No Response			32% 30% 8% 30%	Very Satisfied Satisfied Not Satisfied No Response			53% 27% 8% 15%

shown in Table 1. It is evident that 70 percent to 88 percent of the Spanish speaking parents had no contact at all with the BCL during the first month of the program whereas the percentages having no contact at all were reduced to 35 to 54 percent at the end of the year. The changes in the percent of parents having some or quite a lot of contact with the BCL show the ways most Spanish speaking parents benefited from the program. The BCL activity for which the greatest percent of parents reported quite a lot of contact at the end of the year (44 percent) was that of translator in conferences with other school personnel. The BCL activity which received the lowest report of parental contacts was discussing non-school related problems. These data suggest that the primary role fulfilled by the BCL was that of translator. An indication that translating is an important function as viewed by Spanish speaking parents can be seen in the final ratings of the BCL services. At the end of the year 53 percent of the parents were very satisfied with the BCL services and 27 percent were satisfied. It should be noted, however, that at the end of the year 35 percent of the Spanish speaking parents had not met the BCL, 42 percent had not discussed their child's progress with the BCL, 44 percent had not discussed school related problems with the BCL and 38 percent had not had the BCL serve as a translator in conferences with other school personnel. Despite these sizeable percentages who had no contact with the BCL, it should be noted that more than half had some contact or quite a lot of contact with the BCL.

In order to test the significance of the differences reported in parents' pre- and post-program ratings of the BCL and changes in their attitudes toward schools, a t-test for uncorrelated data was performed on the scores. Responses were weighted by assigning values of 3, 2 and 1 to the level of contact responses and the ratings of satisfaction with BCL services. The nature of parental attitudes was assessed through responses to the items eliciting their opinion of the responsiveness of the school to parental activity. The most positive response (strongly disagree) was weighted as 5 decreasing to a value of 1 for the most negative response (strongly agree). The results of the analysis of the pre-program and post-program responses by parents are presented in Table 2.

The t-test for uncorrelated data show that the numbers of contacts between Spanish speaking parents and the BCL did increase significantly during the year. The t-ratio of 2.68 is significant at the .01 level. The analysis of the ratings of satisfaction with the BCL services, however, did not change significantly from the pre- to the post-program ratings. Furthermore, the parents' attitudes toward the schools did not change significantly during the year. Both analyses resulted in t-ratios

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-PROGRAM SCORES FOR SPANISH PARENTS' CONTACTS WITH THE BCL, RATINGS OF BCL'S SERVICES AND ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL

	N	PRE $\bar{X}$	S.D.	N	POST $\bar{X}$	S.D.	DIFFER-ENCE	t-RATIO	p
Contact with BCL Score	185	6.17	2.57	209	8.69	3.29	2.52	2.68	.01
Rating of Services Provided by BCL	130	2.35	0.67	178	2.61	0.69	0.26	1.10	NS
Parental Attitude Toward School (ESL Parents)	161	6.64	2.35	190	6.74	2.18	0.10	1.06	NS

that were not significant. These data support the conclusions that (1) the number of contacts between Spanish speaking parents and the BCL did increase during the program, (2) the Spanish speaking parents did not consider the services provided by the BCL to be any more satisfactory at the end of the year than they did at the beginning of the year, and (3) Spanish speaking parents did not significantly increase the positive nature of their attitudes toward the schools during the year.

Academic Performance of Non-English Speaking Students. The second objective of the Bilingual Community Liaison Program was to improve the academic performance of non-English speaking students. Records of student and parent contacts were kept by the BCL to indicate the date of the contact and the nature of the problem. In addition to the student contact records, one BCL kept a daily log of activities. From these records, non-English speaking students who had direct contact with the BCL or whose families had direct contact could be separated from non-English speaking students who had no direct contact with the BCL. Due to the limited number of children at each grade level who had direct contact with the BCL, adequate data for analysis were available for the first grade at P.S. 143 only. The pre- and post-program scores for non-English speaking students who had direct contact with the BCL (or whose families had direct contact) were compared to scores of non-English speaking children who did not have direct contact with the BCL were compared by an analysis of covariance. Since the reading and math test could not be administered to first graders at the beginning of the year, the language subtest of the _New York City Pre-Reading Test_ and the _Boehm Test of Basic Concepts_ were used as covariates.

The results of the analysis of covariance presented in Table 3 show that the scores of non-English speaking children who had direct contact with the BCL did not differ significantly from the scores of non-English speaking children who did not have direct contact with the BCL. Therefore, it is evident that the academic performance (basic concepts, reading and math) of non-English speaking children was not improved perceptibly by contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

In order to account for the extremely small number of children for whom data were available for analysis and to describe the way the two BCLs spent their time, the student contact records and the daily log were examined. Only 41 student contact records were submitted by one BCL who serves a school with several hundred non-English speaking students. Furthermore, the records indicate that the majority of contacts with students dealt with behavior problems suggesting that this BCL functioned as a Spanish speaking assistant principal. The other BCL submitted student information cards on more than 300 non-English speaking children in the school, however, the records indicate that direct contact was made with only 44 children or their families. This represents

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCES OF NON-ENGLISH STUDENTS WHOSE FAMILIES HAD CONTACT WITH BCL WITH NON-ENGLISH STUDENTS WHOSE FAMILIES HAD NO CONTACT WITH BCL
P.S. 143 FIRST GRADE

	N	Pre	Post	Adjusted Post	df	F-ratio	p
Boehm Test of Basic Concepts							
No BCL	15	32.20	40.93	40.77	1/22	.218	NS
BCL	10	30.40	39.70	39.94			

	N	Language Covariate	Total Reading	Adjusted Post	df	F-ratio	p
Total Reading M.A.T. Primary I							
No BCL	15	23.67	2.05	2.06	1/22	.013	NS
BCL	10	24.00	2.11	2.09			

	N	Boehm Covariate	Total Math	Adjusted Post	df	F-ratio	p
Total Math M.A.T. Primary I							
No BCL	15	32.20	1.51	1.49	1/22	.085	NS
BCL	10	30.40	1.44	1.46			

less than 15 percent of the Spanish speaking population in the school. It should be noted that the daily log included references to contacts or conversations with several people which were not recorded on student record cards. There is no way to ascertain whether these were parents of non-English speaking children in the school.

The daily log of one BCL indicated that time was spent teaching Spanish to teachers and English to parents. This appears to be a valid contribution even though the results did not visibly affect the academic performance of the non-English speaking students.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The number of contacts between Spanish speaking parents and the Bilingual Community Liaison increased significantly during the 1972-73 academic year.

2. The level of parental satisfaction with the services of the Bilingual Community Liaison did not change substantially from the beginning of the program to the end.

3. Spanish speaking parents did not significantly increase the positive nature of their attitudes toward the schools during the year.

4. The academic performance of non-English speaking children was not increased significantly by contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

5. Less than 15 percent of the non-English speaking population in P.S. 19 and P.S. 143 had direct contact with the Bilingual Community Liaison.

6. On the basis of the findings of this evaluation, it is recommended that the Bilingual Community Liaison Program be drastically revised or discontinued.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANT FOR TRAINABLE MENTALLY RETARDED (TMR) PROGRAM AT P.S. 19

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

To extend individualization of instruction to CRMD pupils at P.S. 19 through the assistance of a paraprofessional as a means of promoting growth in specific behavioral areas related to academic performance.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. Given pre-post teacher ratings on the Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale (DESB), CRMD pupils will manifest significant improvement in behavioral areas initially diagnosed as problem areas.

2. Given at least two unannounced classroom observations and two interviews, inferential professional judgment will indicate expansion of individualized instruction for CRMD pupils and the degree of program effectiveness

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN OPERATION

According to the proposal, the program objective was to be achieved in the following manner:

> The Educational Assistant together with the TMR resource teacher of the school and the two TMR teachers will participate in daily and long range planning; work with instruction of small groups or individual children in reading and mathematics according to the plans made with the TMR teachers; accompany individual children or groups as necessary; assist with audio-visual aids and the utilization of instructional materials; assist

> in their lunch period. The Educational Assistant will also aid the pupils by giving more individualized attention and encouragement to the TMR pupils. The Educational Assistant will service approximately 25-30 TMR children at P.S. 19.

Results of the evaluation indicate that the program generally adhered to the described procedures with the result that effective services were provided to the TMR children.

Program Organization. P.S. 19 serves a total of 56 Children with Retarded Mental Development (CRMD). Of these, sixteen children are considered to be Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR) with scores on intelligence tests of at least three standard deviations below the mean. Goals for such children frequently include development of language and self-care skills; development of self-awareness and social behaviors; and development of functional academics and occupational skills. The remaining 40 children, classified as Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR), show greater potential in those capacities which comprise intelligence and are functionally more advanced than TMR pupils.

Currently, the role of the Educational Assistant has been clearly delimited to TMR pupils. This was a positive change from 1971-72 when the evaluation found that the Assistant's job included groups of EMR children as well. The present role permits the Assistant to focus her attention on a more homogeneous pupil population and to make better use of her personal strengths as well as meeting the stated program objective that the service be based on needs of TMR pupils.

The TMR pupils are organized in two classes of eight children each. The younger group ranges in age from nine to 14 while the older class ranges from 14 to 17. The Educational Assistant's schedule provides for time with each of the TMR groups.

Staff. The Educational Assistant at P.S. 19 is the same person who held that position in 1971-72. She is a grey-haired, sturdy woman of 58 years who came to the United States from Cuba in 1955. As noted in the last evaluation, her "...soft-spoken, evenly-paced appearance transmitted grandmotherly qualities of maturity, patience and nurturance" (p. 112). Further, she is bilingual which permits her to communicate well with Spanish speaking TMR pupils and their parents. She is frequently used in this capacity when home contacts need to be made. Since several children speak only Spanish and possess severe language and speech handicaps, the bilingual ability is particularly valuable.

Prior to her employment in the TMR program, the Educational Assistant worked for approximately six years in various paraprofessional roles in the Headstart Program at P.S. 146, Manhattan. She came to her current job in 1971 with neither training nor experience in the field of mental retardation. While the Educational Assistant expresses desire to improve her competence, she has not yet undertaken professional preparation to supplement the supervision which she receives from the TMR resource and classroom teachers. The Educational Assistant has not made plans for completion of coursework as part of the "Career Ladder" program for paraprofessionals.

Program Content. Although the duties of the Educational Assistant include aiding in the arrival and departure of pupils on the school bus, accompanying groups on trips into the community, and helping during lunch, the majority of her time is spent assisting with direct instruction of pupils under the guidance of the TMR teachers.

Particularly, the Educational Assistant works with those pupils who require a high degree of supplemental remedial attention beyond that given by the teacher. In that capacity, she was observed working with non-English speaking pupils who were recent arrivals to the United States. Emphasis was placed on the development of receptive and expressive oral language. Speech was elicited through presentation of auditory and visual discrimination tasks and perceptual-motor training experiences. Activities observed include:

1. Identification and oral labeling of various parts of the body
2. Identification, oral labeling, and discrimination of primary colors
3. Using markers to color within prescribed boundaries
4. Matching, sorting, and sequencing of wooden numerals

The Educational Assistant works with certain TMR pupils who are at a comparatively advanced level and, thus, frees the teacher to offer more basic instruction where necessary. She was observed assisting two adolescents in functional academic areas of writing and arithmetic. One pupil learning to write her own name had made substantial progress as evidenced by samples of earlier efforts.

The Educational Assistant also was observed helping the teacher during instructional and recreational large group activities. During a period stressing rhythm development, she assisted pupils in imitating rhythmic patterns using percussion instruments while the teacher played a piano. Similarly, for a task of throwing beanbags into a small box she was translating directions into Spanish and aiding a pupil who was keeping score.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Observations and Interviews. Based upon the observational and interview format specified, the evaluator found that the program led to significant expansion of individualized instruction for TMR pupils. Reports by TMR teachers indicate that the presence of the Educational Assistant permitted them to plan more flexibly for the needs of individual pupils, to implement several levels of instruction to small groups, and to organize more varied large group experiences. Additionally, the TMR teachers cited evidence that the Educational Assistant's effect upon pupils' language development, self-care skills, and knowledge of functional academics varied in relation to her type and degree of continuous contact with the individual pupil. Those pupils regularly scheduled with the Educational Assistant for focused purposes tended to derive the greatest benefit.

The resource teacher and TMR classroom teachers held an evaluation session with the Educational Assistant during the Spring. At that time, her current functioning was discussed and plans for future directions formulated. All parties felt that the meeting was productive.

Professional judgment is that the role of Educational Assistant was implemented in a manner which led to pupil growth. The Assistant's greatest strengths are her personal characteristics of flexibility, and genuine concern for the pupils. She enjoys her work with TMR pupils and feels that a contribution to their development is being made. She communicates in an open, non-threatening manner; is highly supportive to pupils' efforts; rarely is critical and never is punitive.

The frequent, high quality supervision provided to the Educational Assistant over the past two years has led to her development in the instructional role. She is now more familiar with learning materials and procedures used in the TMR classes. Yet, the instructional role remains her most serious limitation. While she is quite intuitive, the Educational Assistant lacks many of the technical skills needed to help pupils get the most from educational activities. Since she probably will not take relevant academic coursework, it is likely that the Assistant will continue to be totally dependent upon teacher supervision and will take little initiative for program planning.

On balance, the Educational Assistant is very much an assistant. She relates well to pupils and teachers, participates in all aspects of the program, uses supervision well, and seems quite dedicated to the work. Despite her lack of formal training, evidence of pupil work and teacher ratings suggest that she is effective in helping TMR pupils to learn.

Measurement of Pupil Progress. As indicated in the Interim Report, the decision was made not to utilize the Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale (DESB) in evaluating the TMR pupils on pre-post-program basis. Rationale for the decision included:

1. One of the two TMR teachers went on a semester's sabbatical leave in February 1973. Her replacement was a teacher who had never before worked with retarded children. It was believed that a pre- post-program evaluation based on teacher reports in such a situation would have limited reliability.

2. The DESB was originally formulated for use with children functioning above the TMR level. While useful for EMR pupils, it was believed that the behavioral descriptors of the DESB were unrelated to the problems of the TMR pupil and would not serve as appropriate items in an evaluation instrument.

While anticipating that a self-concept scale utilizing pupil reports would be substituted for the DESB, it was found that the language ability required to respond to the simplest questions was far above the level of most TMR pupils. This plan was also discontinued.

Future evaluations should consider use of the Adaptive Behavior Scale available from the American Association on Mental Retardation. This scale was formulated for use with the severely retarded and is a teacher report schedule based on classroom observation of pupils.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Educational Assistant with TMR pupils at P.S. 19 provides valuable services to those pupils. Evidence from teacher ratings, work of pupils, and observation/interview procedures indicate that pupils are receiving additional individualized instruction because of the Assistnat's presence and that such instruction leads to pupil learning. In large part, the success of the program is due to the amount and quality of supervision offered to the Assistant and to the personality characteristics of the individual in the role.

The Educational Assistant is now used only with TMR pupils. This is an important, positive change from 1971-72 and follows recommendations made in the evaluation at that time.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several recommendations may be made:

1. The Educational Assistant should be encouraged to take coursework relevant to her role with TMR pupils to gain additional technical instructional skills.

2. Greater use could be made of the Educational Assistant's skill in sewing and homemaking with TMR pupils.

3. An additional Educational Assistant for EMR pupils, should be employed. Those children would require a person with different personal and professional skills, but would profit from supplemental remedial instruction.

THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

In response to the needs of Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration schools, the following objectives were delineated.

Our Lady of Sorrows

1. To develop understanding of basic concepts of quantity, space, and time needed for success in the primary grades.

2. To develop reading skills of first and second grade children through a systematic instructional program (Distar).

Transfiguration

3. To provide corrective reading, math and English as a Second Language instruction to children who are reading below grade level, who are in need of corrective math, and who need English as a Second Language.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The evaluation of the Non-Public School Program was designed to assess the degree to which program objectives were achieved. The objectives of evaluation were:

1. Given the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts on a pre- post-program basis, first and second grade students in the program at Our Lady of Sorrows will show significantly greater gains in understanding basic concepts when compared to a control group.

2. Given a post-test on the S.R.A. Assessment Survey in Reading and Language Arts, first and second grade students in the program at Our Lady of Sorrows will show significantly greater gains in reading and language achievement when compared to a control group.

3. Given pre- post-test scores on reading and math achievement tests, students in the classes served by the paraprofessionals under the guidance of Title I teachers will show gains beyond those expected from the normal classroom program.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

In order to achieve the evaluation objectives, it was necessary to use various methods for collecting pertinent data from the target schools. The three major means of collecting data were: interviews, observations and pre- post-testing.

Interviews and Observations. Interviews and observations were made by a member of the evaluation team. The data gathered from these sources were used to describe and evaluate the program in terms of the principals', Title I teachers' and paraprofessionals' perceptions of the program. The observations of classes in progress, in a certain sense, served to validate some of the perceptions and inferences of principals and teachers.

Testing. The testing phase of the evaluation provided objective data on whether or not the objectives of the program were achieved. It assessed the effects of the program on students' achievement in basic concepts, reading and language skills.

At Our Lady of Sorrows the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts and the S.R.A. Survey Assessment in Reading and Language Arts were the instruments utilized to measure the effects of the program on students' achievement in concepts, reading, and language. At Transfiguration,the Metropolitan Achievement Tests in reading and math were used to measure the effectiveness of the corrective reading program and the corrective math program. In addition, the Gray Oral Reading Test was used to measure oral reading proficiency. Unfortunately, no specific measure of growth in English oral language proficiency was used for children in the ESL Program, however, implications about proficiency in English can be drawn from the reading data.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN OPERATION

The Non-Public School Program functioned in two schools, namely, Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration. Each school developed a program to facilitate and enhance learning for a particular target population.

The priority at Our Lady of Sorrows was to provide a systematic instructional program in reading and language for children in the first and second grades. To this end, the Distar program from Science Research Associates was adopted. This program involves highly structured reading and language techniques and is predicated on various assumptions, such as, some subject matter areas and some modes of learning are better than others; and if learning is to occur, concepts and ideas must be presented sequentially.

The Distar reading and language program was conducted daily, Monday through Friday, from December to the close of school in June. This program was conducted according to the specifications of the Distar consultants; that is to say, that three adults--the Title I teacher and two paraprofessionals--were in the classroom, each working with a group of ten to 12 children. The three adults functioned as a team and had on-going inservice training and evaluation from the District and Distar consultants.

It must be noted that from the time of Distar's inception at Our Lady of Sorrows, the teachers did not feel compelled to comply completely with all of the specific directives of the program. This had no apparent negative effects because the teachers had initiated and built in a certain kind of flexibility that enhanced active student participation and also counteracted student boredom which is often a by-product of repetition of patterns.

Sixty students from the first and second grades were the subjects of this systematic reading and language program at Our Lady of Sorrows. The 30 students at each grade level were divided into three subgroups of ten students each. The selection of eligible students to be serviced was based on the fact that they were originally identified and serviced by Distar programs in neighboring public schools from which the parents transferred their children to Our Lady of Sorrows. These parents had requested the principal to continue with the Distar program at Our Lady of Sorrows. They believed that through Distar their children had the beginnings of a firm foundation for reading and language skills and they did not want to take chances on another technique. The administration conceded to the parents' request. Although the acceptance and implementation of the Distar program at Our Lady of Sorrows was never a problem, during the course of the year the principal and teachers became even more convinced of the appropriateness of the Distar methods for getting children to read and to develop language skills, especially for children who are handicapped in the use of English.

The priority at Transfiguration was corrective reading, corrective math, and English as a Second Language for students in grades 2-9 who were reading below grade level, who were in need of corrective math, and who were in need of English as a Second Language. Two paraprofessionals were assigned to work with Centralized Non-Public School (N.P.S.) Title I Teachers at Transfiguration. One worked daily from 9:00 to 3:00 and the other worked two hours daily. The paraprofessionals assisted the Centralized N.P.S. Title I Corrective Reading Teacher (CRT), Math Teacher, and Egnlish as a Second Language Teacher (ESL).

The Title I CRT spent two days per week at Transfiguration, the math teacher was assigned one day per week, and the ESL teacher was assigned two days per week.

A total of 50 students participated in the three programs at Transfiguration, 17 in corrective math programs and 33 in corrective reading and ESL programs. The corrective math program served four groups of four students per group one day a week, whereas the corrective reading and ESL component of the program served six groups of approximately six students per group two days per week. Selection of students was based on past reading scores and on recommendations of the teachers to the principal.

Based on interviews, observations, and textbook examination, the CRT and ESL teachers with the assistance of paraprofessionals focused on three areas: oral language proficiency, word skills, and comprehension. Language development was given major emphasis because of the participants' need to understand and to speak English. The children who were in the ESL and corrective reading program came from homes where Greek was the native language and English was not spoken in the home.

Individualization at Transfiguration was a high priority in all three programs. However, teachers did instruct the children in groups as well as individually. Students, too, were given opportunities to work individually on projects related to reading, language arts, and math. Children were able to choose areas of interest and had opportunities to be self-directed and creative.

The teachers at Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration were experienced and trained teachers and all but one had worked in these schools previously. Their work was very much facilitated by the assistance of the paraprofessionals in the two schools. In both schools,the paraprofessionals did have some training and prior experience as teacher aides or educational assistants. Paraprofessional and teacher turnover at Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration was virtually nonexistent. There was one exception, the CRT at Transfiguration. There were three changes in teachers in the corrective reading program due to health reasons.

In summary, the teaching staff at Our Lady of Sorrows and Transfiguration was qualified and seemed highly competent. Their competency was manifested in their interest in student achievement, in their awareness of the children's difficulties, in their use of a variety of teaching techniques and audio visual aids, and in their organization and coordination of classroom activities.

EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

Our Lady of Sorrows

Growth in Understanding Basic Concepts. Objective one states that given the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts on a pre- post-test basis, the students in the program will show a significant gain on the post-test. The statistical technique of analysis of co-variance was the method used to assess the gains of the Distar and Non-Distar groups. In this method, the difference between groups on the pre-test is taken into account in assessing the gain made during the program.

Table 1 shows the mean data and the results of the analysis of covariance for grade 1 on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts. It is evident that the Distar group on the pre-test measure began with a mean greater than that of the Non-Distar group. However, the Non-Distar group on the post-test and adjusted post-test performed better and the gain was significantly greater than the Distar group at the .01 level.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR FIRST GRADE ON THE BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS

	N	Pre-Test Mean	Actual Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post-Test Mean	df	F-Ratio	p
Distar	29	37.8621	39.5517	39.1589	1/55	7.2210	.01
Non-Distar	29	36.7931	41.1724	41.5652			

Table 2 shows the results of the analysis of covariance for grade 2 on the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts. At the second grade level, also, the Non-Distar group performed significantly better on the post-test than did the Distar group.

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR SECOND GRADE ON THE *BOEHM TEST OF BASIC CONCEPTS*

	N	Pre-test Mean	Actual Post-test Mean	Adjusted Post-test Mean	df	F-Ratio	p
Distar	29	39.2414	41.1379	42.8397	1/57	5.7877	.05
Non-Distar	31	44.2903	45 7097	44.4177			

In summary, the anticipated projection that the Distar group would perform better and have significantly greater gains than the Non-Distar group was not supported. In both grades, the Non-Distar group at Our Lady of Sorrows performed better than the Distar group.

Growth in Reading Achievement. The second evaluation objective stated that given a post-test on the *S.R.A. Assessment Survey in Reading and Language*, first and second graders in the Distar program will show significantly greater gains when compared to a control group. Tables 3, 4, and 5 show the results of the t-tests for independent samples for grades 1 and 2 on the *S.R.A. Survey Assessment* in reading and language. All Non-Distar groups achieved significantly higher post-test scores than did the Distar groups ($p < .0005$ level). However, caution should be taken in making a generalization concerning the effectiveness of Distar versus Non-Distar. The results cannot be attributed conclusively to the treatment program since a pre-test control measure was not available. The groups cannot be assumed to be equivalent since there are differences in prior educational experiences and the socioeconomic background of the children. In addition, the lack of English proficiency among the children in the Distar group must be considered.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF OUR LADY OF SORROWS FIRST GRADE DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR STUDENTS ON THE POST-SCORES OF THE READING SUBTEST OF THE S.R.A. ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
Distar	33	1.7	.49	1.1	8.2777	.0005
Non-Distar	33	2.8	.55			

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF OUR LADY OF SORROWS SECOND GRADE DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR STUDENTS ON THE POST-SCORES OF THE READING SUBTEST OF THE S.R.A. ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
a.Non-Distar	32	3.3	.77	.90	4.9149	.0005*
b.Distar	30	2.4	.65	.90	5.5583	.0005**
c.Non-Distar	31	3.3	.62			

*Comparison between a and b.
**Comparison between b and c.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF OUR LADY OF SORROWS SECOND GRADE DISTAR AND NON-DISTAR STUDENTS ON THE POST-SCORES OF THE LANGUAGE SUBTEST OF THE *S.R.A. ASSESSMENT SURVEY*

Group	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
a.Non-Distar	32	3.3	.78	1.1	6.7171	.0005*
b.Distar	26	2.2	.48	.9	6.6878	.0005**
c.Non-Distar	31	3.1	.52			

*Comparison between a and b.
**Comparison between b and c.

Transfiguration

In order to assess the effectiveness of the corrective reading and English as a Second Language programs at Transfiguration, it was necessary to use the historical rate of growth and the correlated t-test methods to ascertain whether the gains were significant. The historical rate of growth procedure takes into consideration the individual's own rate of growth. In this method, the student is his own control because the student's anticipated post-test score is compared with his actual post test score. The anticipated post-test score is predicted from his past rate of academic achievement. It is assumed that if a student has an historical rate of growth of .9 he will make similar gains and that these gains cannot be ascribed necessarily to the special program. Hypothetically, then, if a student obtained a 5.2 on the pre-test and has a .9 historical rate of growth, his anticipated post - test score can be predicted to be 6.1. If the anticipated post-test score is exceeded by his actual performance, then it can be affirmed that the gain beyond the anticipated post-test score is the result of the reading program. If, on the other hand, the actual post-test performance is equal to or less than the anticipated post-test score the program cannot be considered any more effective than the regular classroom program.

Growth in Reading Achievement. Using the historical rate of growth procedure and correlated t-tests (on the Gray Oral Reading Test scores) for children in the corrective reading program at Transfiguration, the results show that the children in grades 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9 made significant gains above anticipated whereas children in grade 7 did not. For the total group the average actual mean gain as determined by pre- post-scores was 2.5 years which is significant at the .0005 level and the average mean gain above anticipated post-scores was 2.1, also significant at the .0005 level. Table 6 delineates and summarizes the findings for the Gray Oral Reading Test.

Table 7 summarizes the corrective reading program data as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Again using the historical rate of growth and the correlated t-test methods to assess the significance of gains in reading, it can be seen that children in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 made significant gains when their

TABLE 6

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE GRAY ORAL READING TEST FOR CHILDREN AT TRANSFIGURATION

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test S.D.	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test S.D.	Actual Gain	t-ratio	p	Anticipated Post Mean	Gain Above	t-ratio	p
2	6	1.4	.26	2.5	.34	1.1	7.1452	.0005	1.7	.8	6.0187	.0005
3	5	1.9	.34	3.0	.85	1.1	4.2415	.005	2.1	.9	3.5576	.005
4	5	2.6	.84	5.0	1.41	2.4	7.6172	.0005	2.9	2.1	7.3816	.0005
5	9	2.8	.91	5.8	1.27	3.0	12.6510	.0005	3.1	2.7	11.1989	.0005
7	2	4.5	.14	7.5	2.90	3.0	1.5128	NS	4.9	2.6	1.3076	NS
9	3	7.4	1.62	11.4	.51	4.0	6.2491	.005	7.8	3.6	5.5059	.005
Total Group	30	3.4	.69	5.9	1.21	2.5	6.5694	.0005	3.8	2.1	5.8283	.0005

TABLE 7

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING TEST FOR CHILDREN AT TRANSFIGURATION

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test S.D.	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test S.D.	Actual Gain	t-ratio	p	Anticipated Post Mean	Gain Above	t-ratio	p
2	3	2.2	.23	2.6	.84	.4	3.6064	.025	2.9	-.3	1.9641	.05
3	4	2.6	.50	3.2	.19	.6	2.4159	.05	3.3	-.1	0.1659	NS
4	6	2.9	.75	3.4	.74	.5	2.5747	.025	3.3	+.1	0.4304	NS
5	8	3.1	1.10	3.9	.70	.8	3.4325	.005	3.5	+.4	1.5356	NS
7	2	4.2	1.98	5.5	2.76	1.3	2.2727	NS	4.6	+.9	2.2494	NS
9	3	4.6	.32	5.5	.44	.9	4.0003	.01	4.9	+.6	2.7145	.05
Total Group	26	3.2	.81	4.0	.95	.7	3.0540	.005	3.6	+.2	1.5099	NS

actual pre- and post-scores were compared. The actual gain made in grade 7 was not found to be significant. When comparisons were made between the anticipated post- and actual post-scores, only the ninth graders were found to have made significant gains. Although students in grades 4, 5, and 7 averaged gains above anticipated, their gains were not significantly above those anticipated. The third graders achieved post-test scores significantly below expected. For the group as a whole, the average gain of .2 above expected was not significantly above the gain expected for children in the program.

Growth in Math Achievement. The students in the corrective math program at Transfiguration achieved gains above those which were anticipated as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Table 8 shows that there was a 2.1 mean gain above the anticipated score for the total group which was significant at the .0005 level. Table 8 also delineates the result of the pre-, post-, and anticipated post-comparisons and the t-ratios for two grade level groups.

In Table 9 a summary of the results of third grade students on three subtests for mathematics can be found. The gains of the third graders were significant in all areas: computation, mathematical concepts, and problem solving. According to the post-test results it can be affirmed that program participants are achieving on or above grade level. Therefore, because of their progress, the students are ready to be transferred to the regular math program in the school. The mean gain for third graders was 3.0.

TABLE 8

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE TOTAL SCORE OF THE MATH SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR STUDENTS AT TRANSFIGURATION

Grade	N	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Actual Gain	t-ratio	p	Anticipated Post Mean	Gain Above	t-ratio	p
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.							
3	10	2.0	.32	5.0	.84	3.0	14.2276	.0005	2.3	2.7	13.3719	.0005
5,6,7	7	3.7	.57	5.7	1.10	2.0	8.3699	.0005	4.2	1.5	7.8633	.0005
Total Group	17	2.9	.45	5.4	.97	2.5	11.2987	.0005	3.3	2.1	10.6176	.0005

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-SCORES ON THE MATH SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR THIRD GRADE STUDENTS AT TRANSFIGURATION

Math Subtest	N	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Gain	t-ratio	p
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Computation	10	2.1	.50	5.1	1.61	3.0	9.8690	.0005
Concepts	10	2.1	.59	4.8	.66	2.7	5.0892	.0005
Problem Solving	10	2.1	.34	5.1	1.38	3.0	7.2248	.0005
Total Test	10	2.0	.32	5.0	.84	3.0	14.2276	.0005

Table 10 indicates the results of other grades who participated in the corrective math program. The gain mean of 2.0 was significant at the .0005 level. However, it should be noted that these participants are still at a disadvantage and need to continue the program or a similar one.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of the non-public school programs resulted in the identification of some trends but not conclusive evidence of the programs' effectiveness. Problems associated with the initiation of a new program at Our Lady of Sorrows and some late pre-testing, combine to produce results that are tenuous. The following statements, drawn from the data presented in this report, should not be considered as conclusive ones.

1. The first and second grade Non-Distar groups at Our Lady of Sorrows gained significantly more than the Distar groups in understanding basic concepts of time, space and quantity.

2. The Non-Distar groups at Our Lady of Sorrows achieved significantly higher post-test scores on a reading and language test than did the Distar groups; however, pre-test measures were not available to see if the groups were comparable at the beginning of the program.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-SCORES ON THE MATH SUBTESTS OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST FOR STUDENTS IN OTHER GRADES AT TRANSFIGURATION

		Pre		Post				
Math Subtest	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Gain	t-ratio	P
Computation	7	4.2	.76	6.6	1.60	2.2	2.3076	.05
Concepts	7	3.6	.46	5.6	.68	2.0	12.738	.0005
Problem Solving	7	3.0	.32	5.1	1.11	1.8	4.2494	.005
Total Test	7	3.7	.57	5.7	1.10	2.0	8.3699	.0005

3. Students in the corrective reading program at Transfiguration in grades 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9 made significant gains above those anticipated for them in reading as measured by the Gray Oral Reading Test. Students in grade 7 did not make gains above those expected.

4. Students in the corrective reading program at Transfiguration in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 made significant gains in reading when actual pre- and post-test scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were compared, however, only the ninth graders made significant gains when their anticipated post-test scores were compared to their actual post-test scores.

5. Students in the corrective math program at Transfiguration made significantly larger gains than those anticipated for them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on a recognition of the tenuous nature of the conclusions drawn above and observation and interview data, the following recommendations are made.

1. The Distar Programs should be continued at Our Lady of Sorrows and the effectiveness of the program should be tested adequately. The results of this evaluation cannot be used as definitive evidence of the program effects on students.

2. The corrective reading and math programs at Transfiguration should be continued. By reducing staff changes increased stability can be brought to the program.

3. The English as a Second Language Program was not evaluated since no adequate growth measures were obtained. The continuation of this program is a decision to be made by the staff involved until a complete evaluation is conducted.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

The primary objective of the Title I English as a Second Language Program was:

To provide instruction in English as a second language in order to increase program participants' oral language fluency in English.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In order to assess program effectiveness, the following evaluation objective was used:

Given oral English fluency ratings on a pre- and post-test basis, pupils will manifest significant gains in ability to use English.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Two measures were used to assess pupil growth in English as a second language. The *Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability of Pupils* (see Appendix A) provided a measure of pupils' productive facility in English and is based on teacher ratings of children's oral skills in several language areas. The *Linguistic Capacity Index*, developed at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, was used as a measure of the pupils' receptive competence in English. Both tests were administered to students on a pre- and post-program basis.

In addition, observations were made of the ESL teachers and interviews were held with the program coordinator.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

The Title I English as a Second Language (ESL) Program was implemented in January, 1973 as a half year program to service children in the target population at three schools, P.S. 68, P.S. 81, and I.S. 61. One ESL teacher was assigned to each of the elementary schools and two were assigned to the intermediate school.

Program Design. Based on recommendations from the previous year's evaluation, an effort was made to design a carefully planned program that was structured to provide students with consistent and intensive daily instruction in English over the entire treatment period. The proposed design called for 48 pupils to be serviced by each of the elementary ESL teachers and 50 to be serviced by each ESL teacher in the intermediate school. Thus, 196 students were to be serviced by the program.

At the two elementary schools, the 48 students were to be divided into three groups. Two groups of 16 pupils each were to meet five times a week in one and a half hour sessions for a total of seven and a half hours of instruction each week. These 32 pupils were to be drawn from among the students in the target population who were rated lowest (categories F, E and D) in

English proficiency based on the Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability of Students. The third group of 16 pupils was to meet four times a week for one hour and 15 minute sessions, a total of five hours of instruction weekly. This group was to comprise students in categories "F," "D," and "E" who could not be serviced in the first two groups. Remaining places could be used to service students who received a "C" rating on the oral fluency scale.

At the intermediate school, the design called for each teacher to divide the 50 pupils into five groups of ten students each. Each group would meet for 45 minutes per day, five days a week, a total of three hours and 45 minutes of instruction weekly. Three of the five groups were to be comprised of students most in need of instruction in English; those rated "F," "E," and "D" on the oral language scale. The remaining two groups were to be selected primarily from the "D" and "C" categories.

Five preparation periods per week were built into the program structure to be used by the TESL's (Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages) for program related activities such as lesson planning, screening, placement and orientation of new pupils, record keeping, administering tests, and conferences with teachers, parents, guidance counselors, supervisors, etc. In addition, the TESL's could use these periods to provide further individualized instruction to students in the "F" language category.

The program was coordinated by the District English as a Second Language Specialist who was responsible for conducting monthly inservice teacher training sessions and providing ongoing program supervision.

Program Implementation. Examination of class rosters, observations in the schools, and interviews with the staff revealed that the ESL Program was not implemented according to the design described above. Scheduling difficulties, the number of students actually in need of instruction versus the number planned for, the fluctuation in the target population, and administrative preferences were factors which brought about substantial changes in the structure of the program at each school. In general, the result was that each teacher had more groups, of varying sizes, meeting differing amounts of time during the week than originally planned.

For example, at one of the elementary schools, instead of the 48 students called for in the design, the ESL teacher serviced approximately 80 students who were organized into seven instructional groups varying in size from ten to 14 students. Each group met for only 45-minute instructional periods, with one group meeting five times a week, while two groups each met four, three and two times a week. At the other elementary school, the ESL teacher had eight instructional groups varying in size from five to 15 students. The amount of instruction received by these groups ranged from a total of 20 minutes per week for two groups to a total of six hours per week for other groups. Modifications were made at the intermediate school also, but the program was more similar to the proposed design in that each teacher had five groups receiving instruction for sessions of approximately 45 minutes. However, one of the groups met only twice a week while another had two sessions per day five days per week. In general, however, those children rated lowest in English at each school did receive the most instruction.

The modifications that were made at each of the three schools did result in a larger number of students being serviced by the program than originally planned. However, the changes also meant that the average amount of time each student received instruction was diminished considerably. Clearly, the District 24 staff must weigh the gains to be derived from servicing a large number of students with less instruction against the gains to be derived from providing a smaller number of students with more instruction.

Another problem encountered in the program, relates to the relatively high amount of fluctuation in the student population. As children who spoke no English were admitted to the school, it was necessary to transfer program participants to other ESL classes,if available,or to move them into mainstream classrooms in order to provide new arrivals with instruction in English.

In addition, a number of participants' families moved and their places in the program were filled by new arrivals or other non-native speakers in need of English instruction.

To determine the extent of fluctuation in the program population, the evaluators established a system whereby teachers were to submit a New Entrant, Exit, or Transfer Information Form (see Appendices B, C and D) when a program participant's status was changed. Data from these records revealed that approximately half of each Title I teacher's original group was exited or transferred during the term and replaced by new entrants. The transient nature of the non-English speaking populations in New York City is well known and presents a difficult problem for those trying to design instructional programs for children from these populations. In District 24, instability in the program population further reduced the amount of instruction students received. Too often children had to be moved into mainstream classrooms before they had sufficient proficiency in English to successfully achieve in the regular classroom program.

EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

Data collected from the teachers indicated that 13 different native languages were represented by children in the ESL Program. The highest percentages spoke Spanish (43 percent of the children), Italian (27 percent), and Yugoslavian (16 percent). The remaining 14 percent of the children spoke ten other languages.

District 24's aim is to develop non-native children's language facility in English so that they will be able to function adequately in school. To this end, the oral-aural approach was emphasized in teaching English as a second language. This section of the report presents data on the children's growth in English language skills.

Two measures were used to assess the extent to which the program objective was achieved. The results are based on data for all children in the program for whom pre and post program scores were available on both of the evaluation measures. This was a total of 121 pupils.

Productive English Language Proficiency. To assess children's growth in productive English language skills, teacher ratings on the Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS) were used. This scale is a modification of the "A-F" N.Y.C. Board of Education Language Rating Scale which was prepared and tested last year by the District ESL staff. Each child is individually tested and rated in five language areas: structural patterns, vocabulary, pronunciation, situation interpretation, and intonation (see Appendix A). In each area the child is rated on a six-point scale from A=6 to F=0, with "F" representing "Speaks No English." The ratings in each area are summed and divided by five to obtain the child's English oral fluency score.

The Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS) was used initially to screen children in the target population at each school. Children in the "F" to "C" category were selected for the program, however, pupils in the lowest categories were to receive priority. Teachers' pre-program ratings on the OLAS were compared to post-program ratings for evaluation purposes. Because no control group was available for comparison, a groups by test analysis was done in order to derive as much information from the data collected as possible. The subjects were divided into two groups: the first included children in grades kindergarten to five, and the second included children in grades seven and eight. No data were available for children in grades six and nine.

The sample sizes, pre- and post-program mean ratings, the mean gains and the results of the analysis of variance for each OLAS language area and the total OLAS oral fluency score are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that at the beginning of the program elementary children were rated higher than junior high school students in four areas: vocabulary, pronunciation, intonation and total oral fluency, however, at the end of the program they had higher mean ratings in all the areas. The data also show that the elementary children made the greater gains in structural patterns, vocabulary, situation interpretation, and total oral fluency whereas the junior high students made the greater gains in pronunciation and intonation.

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' GAINS ON THE ENGLISH ORAL LANGUAGE ABILITY SCALE (OLAS)

Group	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Gain	Analysis of Variance Results			
					Source	df	F-Ratio	p
Structural Patterns								
K-5	45	0.91	2.42	1.51	Groups(G)	1/119	1.72	NS
7-8	76	1.43	2.23	.80	Tests (T)		196.51	.001
					GxT		20.27	.001
Vocabulary								
K-5	45	2.11	2.84	.73	Groups(G)	1/119	6.52	.01
7-8	76	1.80	2.50	.70	Tests (T)		87.81	.001
					GxT		0.05	NS
Pronunciation								
K-5	45	2.67	2.82	.15	Groups(G)	1/119	50.82	.001
7-8	76	1.87	2.32	.45	Tests (T)		26.37	.001
					GxT		4.57	.05
Situation Interpretation								
K-5	45	1.22	2.62	1.40	Groups(G)	1/119	0.99	NS
7-8	76	1.41	2.17	.76	Tests (T)		264.02	.001
					GxT		25.01	.001
Intonation								
K-5	45	1.78	2.36	.58	Groups(G)	1/119	2.77	NS
7-8	76	1.46	2.33	.87	Tests (T)		123.03	.001
					GxT		4.19	.05
Total Score (Oral Fluency)								
K-5	45	1.74	2.62	.88	Groups(G)	1/119	5.11	.05
7-8	76	1.59	2.30	.71	Tests (T)		275.78	.001
					GxT		3.35	NS

These data suggest that there were systematic differences in the English language learning that took place among children in the two groups. This is confirmed by the results of the analysis of variance.

As Table 1 shows, all F-ratios for Tests (T) are highly significant ($p < .001$) indicating that for the total Title I ESL sample, regardless of grade level, children in the program made significant pre- to post-program gains in each language area and in total oral fluency in English as measured by teacher ratings. However, the interaction (GxT) F-ratios highlight the differences in group gains. As can be seen, the interaction F-ratios for structural patterns, and situation interpretation are highly significant ($p < .001$) indicating that the elementary children far exceeded the junior high school students in achievement in these two skill areas. The differences in mean gain in intonation and pronunciation favoring junior high school students are also significant but the F-ratios for these two subtests are substantially lower than those for structural patterns and situation interpretation, and reach significance only at the .05 level. The F-ratios for vocabulary and total oral fluency were not statistically significant at the .05 level indicating that the greater gains made by the elementary children were not significantly higher than those made by the junior high school students.

The data do indicate that based on teacher ratings elementary children, in general, made the greater gains in English language skills even though they were rated as having more proficiency in English at the beginning of the program than the junior high students. This finding is not inconsistent with general knowledge in the field of language learning. Language learning is generally greater among younger children.

Another finding is worth consideration by the District 24 staff. Although both groups made significant gains in all areas, the elementary children made the greater gains in skills related substantively to communication in the second language, that is, knowledge of structural patterns and situation interpretation, whereas the older children made the greater gains in speech skills, that is pronunciation and intonation. These results may reflect differences in program emphasis at each level and should be studied by the staff.

The total scores on the OLAS were used in another analysis which compares the number of pupils at each oral fluency level at the beginning of the program with the number at each level at the end of the program. The findings are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SUBJECTS AT EACH ORAL LANGUAGE FLUENCY LEVEL AT THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE PROGRAM

Pre-Oral Fluency Level	N	Post-Oral Fluency Level F	E	D	C
F (0- .8)	18	0	9	9	0
E (1-1.8)	53	0	12	35	6
D (2-2.8)	45	0	1	31	13
C (3-3.8)	5	0	0	2	3
Total	121	0	22	77	22

As Table 2 shows, only 18 children (15 percent) in the evaluation sample were rated "F" in oral language fluency at the beginning of the program, while 53 children (44 percent) were rated "E" and 45 (37 percent) were rated "D." The remaining five (4 percent) children received "C" ratings. This data do suggest that, although most of the children selected for the program did fall within the "F to D" priority criterion range, a relatively low number were rated at the category given highest priority, the "F" category. These data must be viewed with caution, however, since the evaluation sample may not be truly representative of the program population. The instability in the program population mitigated against the use of sampling techniques that would have been more representative.

The data in Table 2 do show that based on teacher ratings, half of the 18 children rated "F" initially moved one level to "E" and half moved two levels to the "D" category. Of the 53 children rated "E" initially, 12 (23 percent) remained at the same level, 35 (66 percent) moved one level to "D," and six (11 percent) two levels to "C." For those with "D" ratings at the beginning of the program, one (2 percent) received a lower rating at the end of the program, 31 (69 percent) received the same rating, and 13 (29 percent) moved only one level to the "C" category. The five children rated "C" at the beginning of the program showed no gain in their oral fluency rating. In fact, two of the five were rated one level lower by their teachers at the end of the program.

The data in Table 2 reveal a definite trend in favor of those children rated lowest in English at the beginning of the program. The pattern that evolves is one in which teachers rate more of these children as having moved up more levels in English proficiency than those who began at higher levels of proficiency. This may in fact be the case, but since children who speak no English at all at the beginning of the program likely will appear to have made extensive gain if they speak any English at all at the end of the program, one does need to consider that teachers' post ratings for children in the "F" category probably are inflated. Consider, too, that based on the teachers' own ratings (see Table 2) the conclusion could be drawn that most children in the "D" or "C" category at the beginning of the program made no gains in oral language fluency in English. These findings do suggest that teachers' subjective ratings on language measures such as the OLAS are inadequate measures for assessing pupil growth in English as a Second Language.

Receptive English Language Proficiency. In order to obtain a more objective measure of pupil growth in English as a second language, arrangements were made to administer the Linguistic Capacity Index (LCI) on a pre- and post-program basis. This test was developed as a measure of English language readiness and has been used to assess pupil achievement in learning English as a foreign language.

The LCI is a receptive language measure consisting of three sections: vocabulary recognition, contrastive phonology, and contrastive grammar. A total score is derived from the sum of the three subsection scores. Table 3 presents the sample sizes, pre- and post-program means, the mean gain and the results of the groups by test analyses of variance for each subtest and the total score on the Linguistic Capacity Index.

The data in Table 3 show that the elementary children had slightly lower pre-test mean scores but higher post-test scores than the junior high school students on each of the three subtests and on the total LCI score. As the table shows, the elementary children more than doubled the gain made by the junior high school students in each area, suggesting again that there were systematic differences in language achievement among children in the two groups. This is substantiated by the results of the analyses of variance.

As the F-ratios for Test (T) indicate, children in the ESL Program, regardless of grade level, did make statistically significant ($p < .001$) pre-to post-program gains in each of the language areas measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index. However, as the interaction (GxT) F-ratios show, the elementary children made significantly ($p < .001$) greater gains in all areas than the junior high school students.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GAINS ON THE LINGUISTIC CAPACITY INDEX (LCI)

					Analysis of Variance Results			
Group	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Gain	Source	df	F-Ratio	p
Vocabulary Recognition								
K-5	45	14.80	18.31	3.51	Groups(G)		2.20	NS
7-8	76	15.00	16.46	1.46	Tests (T)	1/119	58.71	.001
					GxT		11.67	.001
Contrastive Phonology								
K-5	45	11.13	14.69	3.56	Groups(G)		2.98	NS
7-8	76	11.57	12.89	1.42	Tests (T)	1/119	57.26	.001
					GxT		12.42	.001
Contrastive Grammar								
K-5	45	12.96	16.76	3.80	Groups(G)		1.09	NS
7-8	76	13.43	15.09	1.66	Tests (T)	1/119	69.27	.001
					GxT		12.32	.001
Total Score								
K-5	45	38.89	49.76	10.87	Groups(G)		2.84	NS
7-8	76	39.91	44.20	4.29	Tests (T)	1/119	106.14	.001
					GxT		23.64	.001

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The English as a Second Language Program was designed to provide program participants with intensive daily instruction in English. Program records, observations by the evaluation team, and interviews with the staff revealed that the ESL Program implemented at each school represented substantial modifications in the structure of the proposed program. These modifications did result in a greater number of students being serviced by the program, however, they also resulted in a concomitant reduction in the amount of English language instruction received by program participants.

Two language measures were used to assess growth in English language proficiency. Analysis of pre and post program scores on the two measures resulted in the following findings:

1. Both elementary and junior high school students in the program made significant gains in receptive and productive English language skills as measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index (LCI) and by teachers' ratings on the "A-F" Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS).

2. Elementary school children made significantly greater gains than junior high school students in knowledge of English structural patterns and in their ability to use English to interpret situations as measured by teacher ratings on the OLAS. Junior high school students showed the greater gains in the speech skills of

pronunciation and intonation. Although elementary students showed slightly greater gains in vocabulary and in total oral English fluency, their gains in these two areas were not significantly greater than those of the junior high students.

3. Elementary school children manifested gains in all receptive English language skills measured by the LCI that were significantly and substantially greater than the gains of the junior high school students.

4. Examination of the number of children at each oral fluency level at the beginning and at the end of the program, revealed that, according to teacher ratings, children at the lowest oral fluency level at the beginning of the program are the ones who made the greatest gains. In addition, teacher ratings on the OLAS suggested that most children who were rated at the higher levels initially ("D" and "C") made no gains in their basic oral English fluency scores. Rather than reflecting the actual language situation among program participants, it is more likely that these findings reflect the basic inadequacy of using teacher ratings as a measure of language growth. Teacher ratings are subjective and, in general, are least adequate for measuring gains among children with some facility in English where measurement of increases in language facility requires more refined instruments. As indicated in last year's evaluation report, the Oral Language Ability Scale can be used "to identify F-rated children, those

who are unable to respond satisfactorily. It is less appropriate for discriminating among "E," "D" or "C" level children."

Although the findings cited above indicate that children in the ESL Program manifested significant pre- to post-program gains in English language proficiency, no conclusive statements can be made about the program's effectiveness. Since no comparison group was available as a control, it is difficult to determine if the gains made by program participants were greater than might have been expected without special instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Efforts should be made to structure the ESL Program so that students receive a sufficient amount of daily instruction in English on a regular basis. In general, growth in language skills is related to the amount of instruction received.

2. A study should be made of the nature and extent of fluctuation in the target population at each school. There is a need for greater stability in the program population. Efforts should be made to provide English instruction to new students admitted during the year without transferring other students to mainstream classrooms before they have developed facility in English that is adequate for successful achievement in the regular classroom curriculum.

3. Because of the subjective nature of teacher ratings, it is suggested that whenever possible more objective measures,

such as the Linguistic Capacity Index, also be used. Multiple measures provide more accurate information for pupil selection, for diagnosis of children's language strengths and weaknesses, and for assessment of pupil achievement in learning English as a second language.

4. Analysis of pre-and post-program scores did indicate that the elementary school children made substantially greater gains in English than did the junior high students. Although the greater language learning facility generally found among younger children may account for this difference, other factors such as differences in instructional approach, program structure and teacher effectiveness may have been operating. These and other factors should be examined in order to determine how the effectiveness of the program might be increased.

5. As recommended in last year's evaluation report, although proficiency in oral English is essential, it is not sufficient for total school success. The program should be extended to include the development of skills in writing and reading English.

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The full year Optional Assignment (O.A.) and the half year Title I Corrective Reading Programs had the following as primary objectives:

1. To provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant so that he will increase his competence in reading.

2. To increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

To assess program effectiveness, the following evaluation objectives were delineated:

1. Given pre-and post-test scores, program participants will manifest significant improvement in (a) total reading achievement, (b) specific reading skills, and (c) attitude toward reading.

2. Given pre-and post-program scores for reading achievement and reading attitude children in the Corrective

Reading Program will manifest significantly better improvement in reading when compared to students in a parallel program which does not use paraprofessionals.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

In order to assess the effectiveness of the program in achieving the stated objectives, the following methods were used. Questionnaires eliciting the background preparation of the Corrective Reading Teachers, their assessment of the inservice training provided, and their assessment of the effectiveness of the program (see Appendix A) were administered. In addition, the opinions of the principals, the program coordinator, and classroom teachers with students in the Corrective Reading Program were elicited through questionnaires (see Appendices B, C, and D).

Three measures were used to assess pupil growth in reading. Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were used as the measure of pupils' total reading achievement. Growth in specific reading skills was assessed by scores on the subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and pupils' attitude toward reading was measured by the Index of Reading Attitude (see Appendix E). The three measures were administered on a pre- and post-test basis.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN OPERATION

Program Implementation. In September, 1972, District 24 implemented a full year Corrective Reading Program for Optional Assignment pupils in nine schools, six elementary schools and three junior high schools. Then, in January, 1973, additional corrective reading services were provided for children in the Title I target populations at three schools, two elementary and one intermediate school. Table 1 shows the schools, the number of teachers and the number of students in the Optional Assignment and Title I Corrective Reading Programs.

TABLE 1

SCHOOLS, NUMBER OF TEACHERS AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE TITLE I AND OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAMS

School	Number Teachers	Number of Students	Program
P.S. 68	1	55	Title I
P.S. 71	1	55	Optional Assignment
P.S. 81	1	55	Title I
P.S. 87	1	55	Optional Assignment
P.S. 88	1	55	Optional Assignment
P.S. 91	1	55	Optional Assignment
P.S. 113	1	55	Optional Assignment
P.S. 153	1	55	Optional Assignment
I.S. 61	2	110	Title I
J.H. 93	1	55	Optional Assignment
J.H. 119	1	55	Optional Assignment
J.H. 125	1	55	Optional Assignment
Total	13	715	

TITLE I:		OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT:	
Elementary	110	Elementary	330
Intermediate	110	Junior High	165
Total	220	Total	495

As Table 1 indicates, a total of 715 pupils received corrective reading instruction, 495 in the full year Optional Assignment Program and an additional 220 in the half year Title I Program. Of these, 440 were elementary school students in the target populations and 275 were intermediate and junior high school students.

Program Organization. This was the second year of operation for the Corrective Reading Program, the basic structure of which was carefully planned and successfully tested during the 1971-72 school year. Based on the evaluation of the first year's program, some modifications were made in the organization of the 1972-73 program. These modifications brought about a needed reduction in the Corrective Reading Teacher's workload.

This year, the design of both the Title I and the Optional Assignment programs called for each reading teacher to service five (5) instructional groups of approximately eleven (11) students each, a total of 55 pupils per teacher. From the target population at each elementary school, 33 students who were two or more years retarded in reading and 22 students who were less than two years but not less than one year retarded in reading were selected for the program. The 33 more seriously retarded readers were divided into three groups, each of which met three times a week. Two of these groups met for one and a half hour sessions or a total of four and a half hours of instruction a week. The third group of more severely retarded readers met for one hour and 15 minute sessions or a total of three hours and 45 minutes per week. The 22 students with less severe reading problems were divided into two groups, each of which met two times a week for one and a half hours, a total of three hours of instruction weekly.

Each intermediate and junior high school reading teacher met each of the five instructional groups on a daily basis. All pupils in the program at this level received 45 minutes of instruction per day, five days per week, for a total of three hours and 45 minutes per week. Efforts were made to have three of the groups consist of more severely retarded readers, and the other two groups, to consist of less severely retarded readers. Organizing instructional groups into more and less seriously retarded readers as the design called for was more difficult to do at the junior high schools than at the elementary schools, because of scheduling difficulties.

In the Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Program, three 45-minute periods a week were set aside for teachers to provide additional individualized instruction to program participants in need of special attention in skill development or reading in the content areas. In addition, teachers had two 45-minute preparation periods a week for program related activities such as lesson planning, record keeping, preparation of materials, and conferences with parents and teachers. In the Title I Program (P.S. 68, P.S. 81, and I.S. 61) teachers had five 45-minute preparation periods per week in accord with the contract with the United Federation of Teachers.

Program Staff. The program was coordinated by the District's reading specialist for reimburseable programs. His responsibilities included conducting an initial orientation and the biweekly inservice training sessions. Based on last year's evaluation, the elementary and secondary staffs met on alternate weeks so that the inservice training sessions could focus on the special needs and problems of the staff at each level. In addition, the program coordinator was responsible for the ongoing supervision of the program.

1. Corrective Reading Teachers

The eight elementary and the five secondary Corrective Reading Teachers represented a wide range of teaching experiences and background preparation for the task. Of the ten who responded to the Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A), three indicated they had obtained the Bachelor's degree since 1970 and seven had obtained the degree between 1960 and 1969, but none had majored in reading. Of the six who have obtained a Master's degree, only two had reading as their major field of study.

When asked to indicate courses they had taken that were relevant to teaching corrective reading, seven responded they had taken a course in Foundations of Reading Instruction, five had taken a course in Reading in the Content Areas, two had taken courses in Diagnostic Reading Techniques and Corrective Reading Instruction, and one had a course in Individualized Reading. Thus, while some teachers had almost no basic preparation in reading, a few had had extensive training.

The ten teachers reported a range of experience in teaching corrective reading. The group as a whole reported from one to four years of experience teaching corrective reading in the public schools, three reported they had done private tutorial work in reading and three had taught in after-school tutorial reading programs.

Based on the teachers' own reports of their background preparation, and on the fact that six of the ten respondents indicated this was their first year in the District 24 program, it appears that the decision to provide ongoing inservice teacher training as a part of the program was appropriate. In addition to providing needed inservice training, the district should make every effort to recruit corrective reading teachers who have adequate professional preparation for the program.

2. Paraprofessionals

To provide further individualization of instruction to program participants, one full time paraprofessional was assigned to each elementary school Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Teacher. At the Title I elementary schools, four full time paraprofessionals were assigned to the program at P.S. 68 and two were assigned to the program at P.S. 81.

The paraprofessionals were to participate in daily and long range planning, provide assistance with individual and small group instruction, assist with record keeping and preparation of materials, and escort students to and from their classes. Every effort was to be made to recruit the paraprofessionals from the optional assignment sending communities and from the district's Title I target population.

Evaluation of Inservice Training. The inservice training program for the District 24 Corrective Reading Teachers was an attempt to raise the level of teacher effectiveness and thereby increase the possibilities for the success of the program. Biweekly sessions conducted by the program coordinator focused on program organization, selection of students, diagnosis, and remediation of reading problems. New materials were demonstrated and problems related to the program were discussed. The Corrective Reading Teachers at the elementary level and those at the junior high school level met with the program coordinator on alternate weeks so that the discussions could be more specifically directed toward concerns that were crucial to each group.

The Corrective Reading Teachers were asked to evaluate the adequacy of the information presented in the inservice training program on the Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A). Ten of the 13 teachers responded. The rating scale used was: 1=unsatisfactory, 2=barely satisfactory, 3=average, 4=above average and 5=very satisfactory. Items that were not covered were assigned NC. The tabulation of the ratings appears in Table 2.

TABLE 2

CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS' EVALUATION
OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM
(N=10)

	Frequency for Each Rating						
Topic	NC*	1	2	3	4	5	Rating
Organization, administration & supervision of the program	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.3
Program objectives & rationale	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.4
Criteria for selection of participants	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.9
Procedures for selection of participants	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.1
Specific procedures for diagnosis	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.9
Knowledge of reading skills	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.5
Methods of corrective instruction	0	0	3	5	1	1	3.0
Use of instructional materials	1	1	1	5	0	1	3.0
Selection & evaluation of materials	1	0	0	7	1	1	3.3
Organizing class for instruction	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.7
Techniques for evaluating progress	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.9
Record keeping policies & procedures	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.9
Techniques for using paraprofessionals	3	0	1	5	1	0	3.0
Techniques for parent involvement	2	0	1	5	2	0	3.1

*NC=Not covered

The frequencies and mean ratings shown in Table 2 indicate that the Corrective Reading Teachers found the information in the inservice training program related to program objectives, rationale, organization and pupil selection to be well above average. Furthermore, it should be noted that no topic presented was rated below 3.0 (average). In comparison with the ratings of similar components of the inservice training program during 1971-72, this year's assessment by the Corrective Reading Teachers is markedly more positive. Particularly noticeable is the increased rating given to the topics of record keeping (2.7 to 3.9), criteria and procedures for selection (2.8 to 3.9 and 4.1) and organizing the class for instruction (2.9 to 3.7). It is evident that teachers in the program were considerably more positive about the adequacy of the inservice training program during the current year than they were during the previous year. Techniques for using paraprofessionals received the lowest rating (3.0) and even this is higher than the 2.5 rating from the previous year.

The principals, Corrective Reading Teachers and the program coordinator were asked to evaluate the amount and the quality of this year's inservice training program and to compare it with the previous year. A comparison of their responses can be seen in Table 3.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS', PRINCIPALS', AND COORDINATOR'S OVERALL EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Item	Corrective Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)
Was the amount of inservice training sufficient?			
NO	2	2	
YES	8	6	1
DON'T KNOW	0	1	
On a scale of 1 to 5 give your rating for this year's inservice training:			
MEAN RATING	3.6	3.6	4.0
Did you (your teachers) participate in the program last year?			
NO	6	1	
YES	4	8	1
Compared to last year this year's training was:			
INFERIOR	0	1	
ABOUT THE SAME	2	3	
SUPERIOR	2	3	1
NO RESPONSE	0	1	

The responses seen in Table 3 show that the program coordinator and a majority of Corrective Reading Teachers and the principals found the amount of inservice training to be sufficient. These groups found the quality of the inservice training to be well above average. Only one principal, among all those participating the previous year, found the inservice training to be inferior, whereas two teachers and three principals thought it was about the same and two teachers and three principals thought it was superior to the prior year.

The overall ratings of the inservice training program were generally positive and showed a marked increase over the ratings of the previous year. Comments which were written on the questionnaires suggested a need for more demonstration teaching by fellow teachers and the coordinator, more demonstrations of diagnostic techniques and specific skill remediation techniques, and more opportunities for new teachers to observe experienced teachers. It should be noted that six of the ten Corrective Reading Teachers who responded were new to the program this year. The new teachers indicated they would benefit from additional guidance in the implementation of the program.

Evaluation of Program Organization, Facilities and Materials. The organization of the Corrective Reading Program and the facilities and materials used in its operation were evaluated by ten Corrective Reading Teachers, nine principals, the program coordinator, and 63 classroom teachers who had students in the program. The same 1 to 5 rating scale, used throughout all questionnaires, was used to indicate the level of satisfaction for each topic. The mean ratings for program organization, facilities and materials appear in Table 4.

TABLE 4

MEAN RATINGS FOR PROGRAM ORGANIZATION, PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teachers (N=63)
Program Organization				
Organization (scheduling, number of classes, etc.)	4.3	4.6	5.0	3.5
Amount of time allotted for reading instruction	3.9	4.6	5.0	3.6
Number of pupils in each group	3.3	4.6	4.0	---
OVERALL RATING	4.1	4.7	5.0	3.6
Physical Facilities and Materials				
Size of room provided for corrective reading	3.2	4.2	3.0	---
Physical facilities in room	2.7	3.6	3.0	---
Types of instructional materials provided for program	3.3	4.6	5.0	---

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teachers (N=63)
Quantity of materials provided	3.3	4.4	5.0	---
Availability of materials at start of program	3.1	4.6	4.0	---
OVERALL RATING	3.1	4.6	4.0	---

The mean ratings shown in Table 4 show that the general level of satisfaction with the Corrective Reading Program organization is well above average. The item receiving the lowest rating, number of pupils in each group, averaged 3.3 (slightly above average) as rated by the Corrective Reading Teachers. The 3.3 rating is well above the 2.2 rating given this item in the 1971-72 evaluation. The programmatic change from servicing 78 pupils per teacher to servicing 55 pupils per teacher undoubtedly accounts for the increased ratings. One Corrective Reading Teacher did propose that eight was an even more desirable size for the groups.

The overall ratings of program organization by Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, classroom teachers and the program coordinator were well above average to very satisfactory. Some classroom teachers remarked that the scheduling of students disrupted their classrooms and that missing one and a half hours of regular classroom work was difficult for students who were remedial readers. The general tone of comments volunteered was positive, however, and the ratings confirm the favorable attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program organization.

The ratings of physical facilities and materials are generally above average. The Corrective Reading Teachers themselves do not regard their facilities and materials as favorably as others related to the program regard them. The comparison of current ratings with the 1971-72 ratings shows an increase in all areas except for physical facilities in the room. There has evidently been little improvement in the conditions under which some teachers are working.

One discrepancy between ratings occurs in the quantity of materials provided. The Corrective Reading Teachers believe the quantity of materials to be slightly above average (3.3) while the program coordinator believes they are very satisfactory (5.0). The perspective from which the teachers and coordinator view the materials differ. Also, perhaps differences in the distribution of materials occurred so that some teachers were less satisfied. A listing of materials available in the program collated by the program coordinator supports the higher rating of adequacy and variety in materials.

The overall ratings of the physical facilities and materials show the same trends evident in the individual item assessments. The Corrective Reading Teachers rate their level of satisfaction lower than the coordinator or the principals.

The principals rated physical facilities and materials higher than anyone else rated them.

Evaluation of Pupil Selection. The procedures used to select students for the Corrective Reading Program involved averaging students' scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. The use of two scores, rather than the one previously used in the program, was an attempt to arrive at a more realistic assessment of students needing remediation. The single achievement score used in previous years tended to inflate actual performance or show the frustration level at which a student could work rather than his instructional level.

The Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers were asked to rate the procedures used for pupil selection, diagnosis and evaluation. The summary of their ratings appears in Table 5.

TABLE 5

MEAN RATINGS FOR PUPIL SELECTION, DIAGNOSIS AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teachers (N=63)
Pupil Selection				
Criteria used to select pupils	4.3	3.6	4.0	2.7
Procedures used to select pupils	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.0
Assignment to groups on basis of severity of retardation	3.2	4.3	4.0	---
Number of students serviced compared to number who need corrective reading	3.2	2.8	4.0	2.7
OVERALL RATING	3.5	3.8	4.0	2.9
Diagnosis & Evaluation				
Use of informal reading inventory	4.1	---	4.0	---
Use of Metropolitan Reading Test	3.6	3.3	3.0	---
Use of Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test	3.8	4.4	4.0	---
Materials provided for diagnosis & evaluation	3.2	4.2	4.0	---
Record keeping system	3.1	4.7	5.0	---
OVERALL RATING	3.5	4.2	4.0	---

The mean ratings that appear in Table 5 highlight a major area of disagreement among District 24 staff associated with the Corrective Reading Program. The ratings of the Corrective Reading Teachers and the program coordinator are often higher than those of principals and classroom teachers. This trend is most noticeable for the item which asked respondents to rate the number of students serviced compared to the number who need corrective reading. The classroom teachers' rating (2.7) and the principals' rating (2.8) show a much lower level of satisfaction than the Corrective Reading Teachers' rating (3.2) and the program coordinator's rating (4.0). The substance of the disagreement surrounds the issue of giving priority for selection to Title I and Optional Assignment students due to funding requirements. The classroom teachers commented that some children selected for the program did not need remediation as much as other children who were excluded because they did not meet the poverty criterion. One principal suggested that classroom teachers should be consulted during the selection process. While some recognition must be made of the validity of these arguments, it should be noted that guidelines for funded programs are very explicit in this regard and there is a legal requirement to direct the additional services to the target population. The potential dilution of the effects of the program by giving less instruction to more students could result from spreading the services to a larger group.

The overall ratings of the pupil selection procedures ranged from slightly below average (2.9) by the classroom teachers to above average (4.0) by the program coordinator. The issues involved in the disparate ratings perhaps cannot be resolved but at least should be understood by staff associated with the program. The same disparity existed in the 1971-72 program evaluation and perhaps suggests wider distribution of requirements for funded programs.

The summary of the diagnosis and evaluation procedures resulted in above average ratings for nearly every aspect assessed. The combined use of the *Metropolitan Achievement Test* and the *Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test* has increased the overall level of satisfaction with diagnosis and evaluation procedures from the 1971-72 evaluation report. The continued recognition of the need to use the Informal Reading Inventory is supported by the 4.1 and 4.0 mean rating of Corrective Reading Teachers and the program coordinator.

The Corrective Reading Teachers indicate that they want more materials for diagnosis and evaluation which is in accord with their assessment of materials in the preceding section. The record keeping system was rated lowest by Corrective Reading Teachers (3.1) and highest by the program coordinator (5.0). The revisions made in the procedures for keeping the daily logs apparently have increased the level of satisfaction since the

1971-72 evaluation. The 2.4, 3.0, and 4.0 ratings of the record keeping system in effect during 1971-72 has changed to 3.1, 4.7 and 5.0 for the current record keeping system. One teacher commented that improvement in record keeping is needed and suggested uniformity and reduction of repetition.

The overall ratings of pupil diagnosis and evaluation are well above average. The revisions made in the present Corrective Reading Program have noticeably increased the level of satisfaction of the staff associated with the program.

Evaluation of Student and Parent Attitudes Toward the Program. The objective to improve students' attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program was assessed directly from student data, however, the Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and the classroom teachers were also asked to judge students' attitude and progress as well as parents' attitude toward the program. The summary of their ratings appears in Table 6.

TABLE 6

MEAN RATINGS FOR STUDENT AND PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD PROGRAM

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teachers (N=63)
Students				
Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes	4.1	4.3	4.0	3.7
Observable improvement in pupil performance	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.2
Parents				
Extent of parent involvement in the program	2.9	2.2	4.0	---
Parents' attitude toward program	3.7	3.9	4.0	3.7
Time for teachers to confer with parents	3.1	3.3	4.0	---

The mean ratings in Table 6 show a generally high assessment by Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers of students' and parents' attitude toward the program. The ratings range near the 4.0 level indicating that the associated staff believes that the program is viewed above average by students and their parents. Voluntary comments made by several classroom teachers verify the positive nature of students' attitude. Comments such as, "My students like their Corrective Reading Teacher very much and are anxious to go to her room," and "The students in the program have shown a great increase in their desire to read," are indicative of the teachers' assessment of student attitude.

The staff assessment of the observable improvement in pupil performance is nearly as favorable as their assessment of attitudes toward the program. The Corrective Reading Teachers' and the classroom teachers' ratings were lower than the other raters. Many comments by the classroom teachers indicated that their students had made very good progress in reading this year, although one questioned attributing the improvement entirely to the Corrective Reading Program.

The item rated lowest in the staff evaluation of parents' attitude and involvement dealt with the extent of parental involvement in the program. Both Corrective Reading Teachers and principals believe that parents' involvement is little more than barely satisfactory. Both groups believe that parents' attitude toward the program is well above average and that time for parent conferences is above average but it appears they are not satisfied with the extent to which parents actually do become involved.

The staff's ratings of student and parent attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program are generally very positive. The classroom teachers were least positive about this area and even their ratings fell well above average (3.7). All ratings improved when compared to the 1971-72 evaluation.

Evaluation of Personnel Support. The Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers evaluated the level of cooperation, communication and interaction among school personnel in relation to the Corrective Reading Program. The Title I and Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Programs included the use of paraprofessional services at the elementary school level, therefore, an evaluation of the quality of those services is incorporated here. The Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Program was also supported by guidance counselors, however, since their services are evaluated in a separate section of this report, the guidance services are omitted from this part of the evaluation.

The summary of the ratings made of the personnel support by the associated staff appears in Table 7.

TABLE 7

MEAN RATINGS FOR PERSONNEL SUPPORT

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teachers (N=63)
Cooperation of school personnel generally	4.0	4.4	4.0	---
Communication between reading teacher & classroom teacher	3.3	3.3	4.0	3.4
Adaption of corrective reading techniques by classroom teachers	3.3	2.9	4.0	3.1

Item	Reading Teachers (N=10)	Principals (N=9)	Program Coordinator (N=1)	Classroom Teacher N=63)
Time for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers	2.0	2.9	4.0	2.5
Classroom teachers' attitude toward program	4.1	3.9	4.0	---
Paraprofessionals' preparation & skills	3.9	---	---	---
Quality of services provided by the paraprofessionals	4.6	4.1	4.0	---
Teachers' ability to use paraprofessional effectively	---	4.1	4.0	---
Reading teachers' preparation & skills	---	4.2	4.0	---
Quality of instruction provided by the Corrective Reading Teacher	---	4.2	4.0	---
Ongoing supervision by coordinator	4.2	3.6	---	---

The ratings shown in Table 7 indicate a generally high level of satisfaction among the staff related to the Corrective Reading Program. The Corrective Reading Teachers, the principals, and the program coordinator believe that the cooperation from school personnel is well above average. A slight variation occurs in the ratings of communication between the Corrective Reading Teachers and the classroom teachers where the ratings drop from above 4.0 to 3.3 and 3.4. An explanation for this decrease is clearly evident in the ratings of another item--time for Corrective Reading Teachers to confer with classroom teachers. The ratings of 2.0, 2.9 and 2.5 assigned to this item by Corrective Reading Teachers, principals and classroom teachers, respectively, show that very few people are satisfied with this aspect of the program. Clearly, more staff conference time is desired.

The ratings ascribed to the quality of paraprofessionals' services, the interaction between the Corrective Reading Teachers and paraprofessionals, and the level of preparation of paraprofessionals are very positive. Obviously, all groups view the contribution of the paraprofessionals to be a valid and worthy aspect of the program.

The ratings of the quality of instruction provided by the Corrective Reading Teachers and the ongoing supervision provided by the program coordinator were rated well above average. The level of satisfaction toward the central staff of the Corrective Reading Program appears to be high.

Summary Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Program. The Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and the classroom teachers were asked to compare the 1972-73 program with the 1971-72 program. The overwhelming majority of the staff involved the preceding year (four Corrective Reading Teachers, eight principals, one coordinator, and 33 classroom teachers) believed the current program is superior. When asked if they would be interested in participating next year in a similar program, seven of ten Corrective Reading Teachers, all principals, and 60 of 63 classroom teachers said yes. It is evident that District 24 staff recognizes the quality of the Corrective Reading Program they have.

EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

This section discusses the effects of the program on pupil growth in reading and is organized into four sections: growth in reading achievement, growth in specific reading skills, improvement in reading attitude, and the impact of paraprofessional services.

Growth in Reading Achievement. The first objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to improve participants' level of reading achievement beyond that which would be expected from the regular classroom program.

To assess the extent to which this objective was achieved, children's scores on the *Metropolitan Achievement Test* were analyzed using their historical rate of growth as a control against which to compare the effects of the Corrective Reading Program. In this procedure, a pupil becomes his own control in that his historical rate of growth, which is calculated from his previous performance record, is used to predict his expected level of performance if he had received no special instruction. The procedure for determining his rate of growth up to the onset of the special program is to subtract 1.0 from his pre-program achievement score and divide the remainder by the number of months the child has been in school, including the number of years retained. For example, if a fifth grade student scores 4.0 in September, then based on his 40 months of previous schooling, his historical growth rate would be 3.0 divided by 40 or .075 per month, or .75 per school year. By using this historical rate of growth, the child's achievement level at the end of fifth grade can be predicted, i.e., he should be reading at 4.75 according to his previous performance. If, in fact, his anticipated level of performance is exceeded by his actual performance, than it can be claimed with some assurance that the gain beyond that anticipated was due to the effects of the special instructional program. This procedure was used to determine whether theCorrective Reading Program in District 24 had a significant effect on participants' reading achievement levels.

Scores from the April, 1972 administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test were obtained from school records as the pre-program measure and were used as the basis for anticipating students' post-test performance the following April, 1973, when the test was again administered on a district-wide basis. Complete pre-and post-test data for the Metropolitan Achievement Test were available for 376 students or approximately 76 percent of all participants in the full-year Optional Assignment Program. Complete pre-and post-test data for the same test were available for 134 students or approximately 61 percent of all participants in the half-year Title I Program. The size of the evaluation samples is more than sufficiently large to permit generalizations about the effectiveness of the two programs.

A second measure of reading achievement was provided by the comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. The pre-and post-test grade level scores for achievement in comprehension were also analyzed using the historical rate of growth method. Most students' pre-program scores were available in school records from the May, 1972 administration of the test. Those new to the program this year were administered the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test in October as a pre-test measure. Adjustments were made accordingly in calculating the students' post test performance anticipated for May, 1973 when the test was again administered on a district-wide basis. Complete pre-and post-test data on this measure were available for 407 students or 82 percent of the Optional Assignment Program population, and for 128 students or 58 percent of the Title I Program population.

1. Optional Assignment Total Group and Grade Level Results

Using the historical rate of growth method, anticipated post-test scores for the Metropolitan Reading Test were calculated for Optional Assignment students in the Corrective Reading Program. The number and percentage of students at each grade level and in the total group who obtained actual post-test scores below, the same as, or above anticipated in word knowledge, reading comprehension and total reading were compared. The results are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS
SHOWING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS AND ABOVE
ANTICIPATED POST-TEST SCORES ON THE
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

		WORD KNOWLEDGE			COMPREHENSION			TOTAL READING		
Grade	N	Below	Same	Above	Below	Same	Above	Below	Same	Above
3	78	32	5	41	35	8	35	36	7	35
(%)		(41)	(6)	(53)	(45)	(10)	(45)	(46)	(9)	(45)
4	66	14	1	51	29	3	34	16	1	49
(%)		(21)	(2)	(77)	(44)	(4)	(52)	(24)	(2)	(74)
5	86	19	3	64	34	5	47	26	8	52
(%)		(22)	(3)	(75)	(39)	(6)	(55)	(30)	(9)	(61)
6	53	14	2	37	20	1	32	12	7	34
(%)		(26)	(4)	(70)	(38)	(2)	(60)	(23)	(13)	(64)
7	20	6	0	14	9	2	9	6	1	13
(%)		(30)	(0)	(70)	(45)	(10)	(45)	(30)	(5)	(65)
8	43	15	2	26	19	3	21	14	2	27
(%)		(35)	(5)	(60)	(44)	(7)	(49)	(32)	(5)	(63)
9	30	6	0	24	5	0	25	4	2	24
(%)		(20)	(0)	(80)	(17)	(0)	(83)	(13)	(7)	(80)
Total	376	106	13	257	151	22	203	114	28	234
(%)		(28)	(4)	(68)	(40)	(6)	(54)	(30)	(8)	(62)

In Table 8, it can be seen that in grades 3 through 8 more children made gains above anticipated in word knowledge than in reading comprehension. The one exception is at the ninth grade level where more children made gains above anticipated in reading comprehension than in word knowledge. At each grade level, more than 50 percent of the children achieved post-test scores higher than anticipated for word knowledge. The results for reading comprehension, however, show that only in grades 4, 5, 6 and 9 did 50 percent or more of the children achieve above anticipated gains. In grades 3, 7, and 8 only 45 to 49 percent of the children obtained post-test scores above their anticipated scores.

Table 8 also indicates that from 60 to 80 percent of the program participants in grades 4 through 8 achieved gains above anticipated in total reading achievement. The third graders were the exception. Only 45 percent showed gains above anticipated in total reading. Their low gain in total reading can be accounted for by their low performance as a group in both word knowledge and reading comprehension. This same phenomenon of lower achievement among the third grade students was observed last year.

In summary, the data in Table 8 indicate that for the group as a whole a greater percentage of the program participants made gains above anticipated in word knowledge (68 percent) than in reading comprehension (54 percent). For total reading achievement, 62 percent made gains above anticipated, eight percent made gains the same as anticipated, and 30 percent made gains below anticipated.

Tables 9, 10 and 11 present the tests of significance for the actual and above anticipated gains on the vocabulary and comprehension subtests, and the total reading scores of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. As Table 9 shows, children at all grade levels, except the third and eighth, made average actual gains of more than one year in reading vocabulary. These gains are greater than might be expected from average readers. The eighth graders made an average gain of almost one year, however, the third graders averaged only seven months gain in word knowledge.

Table 9 also shows that the mean gains in word knowledge, as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test, were significantly above those anticipated for program participants in the fourth through the ninth grades. Only the third graders did not achieve gains above those anticipated. Instead, their actual average gain in word knowledge was almost exactly the gain that would have been expected without special instruction, based on their historical rate of growth. For the group as a whole, however, students in the program achieved an average gain of four months above anticipated in word knowledge.

TABLE 9

TESTSOF SIGNIFICANCE FOR OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS' ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON VOCABULARY SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test SD	Antic. Post-Test Mean	Antic. Post-Test SD	Actual Post-Test Mean	Actual Post-Test SD	Actual Gain	t-Ratio	p	Gain Above Anticipated	t-Ratio	p
3	78	2.38	.55	3.10	.87	3.09	.75	.75	7.13	.0005	-.01	0.06	NS
4	66	2.60	.37	3.15	.50	3.65	.78	1.05	11.56	.0005	+.50	5.10	.0005
5	86	3.41	.55	3.99	.69	4.53	1.14	1.12	11.20	.0005	+.54	5.42	.0005
6	53	3.91	.79	4.47	.96	5.06	1.22	1.15	8.34	.0005	+.59	4.22	.0005
7	20	4.96	.97	5.62	1.16	6.03	1.25	1.07	5.34	.0005	+.41	1.99	.05
8	43	5.12	1.34	5.69	1.55	6.10	1.94	.98	4.84	.0005	+.41	2.00	.05
9	30	5.45	1.27	6.00	1.43	6.95	1.21	1.50	6.23	.0005	+.95	3.69	.0005
Total	376	3.57	1.33	4.17	1.42	4.61	1.68	1.04	19.87	.0005	+.44	7.85	.0005

TABLE 10

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS' ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON COMPREHENSION SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Grade	N	Pre-Test		Antic. Post-Test		Actual Post-Test		Actual Gain	t-Ratio	p	Gain Above Anticipated	t-Ratio	p
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD						
3	78	2.37	.61	3.09	.97	3.00	.68	.63	7.21	.0005	-.09	0.79	NS
4	66	2.65	.49	3.20	.67	3.32	.54	.67	10.47	.0005	+.12	1.59	NS
5	86	3.53	.68	4.15	.85	4.35	1.07	.82	8.20	.0005	+.20	1.92	.05
6	53	4.03	.87	4.62	1.06	5.08	1.33	1.50	6.56	.0005	+.46	2.79	.01
7	20	5.33	1.12	6.07	1.33	6.11	1.35	.78	3.15	.005	+.04	0.15	NS
8	43	5.14	1.48	5.72	1.71	5.84	1.54	.70	4.37	.0005	+.12	0.69	NS
9	30	5.45	1.24	5.99	1.39	7.04	1.34	1.59	5.90	.0005	+1.05	3.71	.0005
Total	376	3.64	1.40	4.26	1.53	4.47	1.67	.83	16.32	.0005	+.21	3.78	.0005

TABLE 11

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS' ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS IN TOTAL READING SCORE ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

		Pre-Test		Antic. Post-Test		Actual Post-Test							
Grade	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Actual Gain	t-Ratio	p	Gain Above Anticipated	t-Ratio	p
3	78	2.33	.50	3.04	.79	3.02	.69	.69	8.02	.0005	-.02	0.19	NS
4	66	2.60	.35	3.14	.47	3.41	.51	.81	15.47	.0005	+.27	4.84	.0005
5	86	3.45	.54	4.05	.69	4.36	.97	.91	11.06	.0005	+.31	3.86	.0005
6	53	3.89	.72	4.45	.88	5.01	1.22	1.12	7.89	.0005	+.56	3.92	.0005
7.	20	5.07	.98	5.75	1.17	6.06	1.28	.99	5.02	.0005	+.31	1.51	NS
8	43	5.08	1.33	5.65	1.54	5.95	1.70	.87	5.78	.0005	+.30	1.97	.05
9	30	5.44	1.11	5.98	1.26	6.99	1.19	1.55	7.43	.0005	+1.01	4.59	.0005
Total	376	3.56	1.31	4.16	1.40	4.49	1.63	.93	21.08	.0005	+.33	6.94	.0005

Table 10 shows that children at each grade level made average gains in reading comprehension that ranged from approximately six months for the third and fourth graders to gains of a year and a half for the sixth and ninth graders, As the t-ratios indicate, all actual gains were statistically significant. This was not the case for gains made above those expected for each grade level. In fact, only the fifth, sixth and ninth graders in the program obtained gains that were significantly above each group's anticipated achievement. Although the fourth, seventh and eigth graders also averaged gains above those expected for them, their gains were not significantly above their expected gains. Only the third graders, again, did not achieve gains above anticipated, having actually achieved at about their expected rate of growth on reading comprehension also.

For the group as a whole, children in the program averaged gains of two months above their expected achievement level in reading comprehension. It should be noted, however, that the data in Tables 9 and 10 support the conclusion that the program was more effective at developing participants' reading vocabulary than it was at developing participants' skill in reading comprehension This same pattern of results was reported in last year's evaluation, suggesting again that more emphasis should be placed on instruction in reading comprehension.

As Table 11 shows, for the group as a whole, total reading achievement was improved significantly above that anticipated based on the children's previous rate of growth. For the total group the average actual gain was .93 months, a gain of .33 months above expected and very similar to the achievement rate that might be expected of non-remedial readers. However, the data point again to the program's lack of success in helping children in the third grade achieve in reading beyond their previous rate of growth. In addition, the data in Table 11 suggests that there may have been program weaknesses at the seventh grade level, as is indicated by the F-ratio which is not significant for the group's gain above anticipated. This may be due to their relatively low achievement in comprehension, however, since the seventh grade sample was small, the results may not be representative of all children at this grade level. The seventh graders in the evaluation sample did achieve an average of three months above expected, suggesting that the sample may have been too small for the results to reach an acceptable level of significance.

In general, the results of the analyses of pre-and post-program scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test support the conclusion that the Corrective Reading Program was effective in helping Optional Assignment students improve in total reading achievement. This conclusion is supported by the results of analyses of pre-and post-program grade level scores on the comprehension subsection of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

Table 12 shows the number and percentage of Optional Assignment students who achieved post-test scores below, the same as, and above expected in comprehension. The table includes results for a small sample of second graders for whom data were available. Although the program proposal called for only children in grades 3 through 9 to be selected for the program, one group of second graders was included in the program on a trial basis in the hope that children identified as exhibiting reading difficulties this early could be helped before their difficulties became too serious.

TABLE 12

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS, AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED ON THE GRADE LEVEL SCORE OF THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

		STANFORD GRADE SCORE		
Grade	N	Below	Same	Above
2	9	2	1	6
(%)		(23)	(10)	(67)
3	80	29	10	41
(%)		(36)	(13)	(51)
4	68	20	7	41
(%)		(30)	(10)	(60)
5	89	29	6	54
(%)		(32)	(7)	(61)
6	56	23	0	33
(%)		(41)	(0)	(59)
7	30	7	4	19
(%)		(23)	(13)	(64)
8	39	13	1	25
(%)		(33)	(3)	(64)
9	36	7	2	27
(%)		(19)	(6)	(75)
Total	407	130	31	246
Percent		(32)	(8)	(60)

Table 12 indicates that more than 50 percent of the children at each grade level obtained actual post-test scores that were higher than anticipated post-test scores on the Stanford comprehension subtest. Again, the largest percentage to do so was in the ninth grade and the smallest percentage was in the third grade. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test results for the total group, which shows that 60 percent achieved above expected, eight percent achieved the same as anticipated, and 32 percent achieved below anticipated, are more favorable but still similar to the comprehension subtest results from the Metropolitan Achievement Test, which indicated that 54 percent achieved above, six percent achieved the same as, and 40 percent achieved below expected (see Table 8).

Table 13 presents mean data and the results of tests of significance for actual and above anticipated gains on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test grade level score for program participants' achievement in reading comprehension. There, it can be seen that children in the evaluation sample at each grade level, including the third grade, made gains significantly above those expected. In general, the mean gains above anticipated in reading comprehension when measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were higher than when measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test. This may be due to the fact that pre-program Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test results were used as a

TABLE 13

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS' ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE GRADE LEVEL SCORE OF THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

		Pre-Test		Antic. Post-Test		Actual Post-Test							
Grade	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Actual Gain	t-Ratio	p	Gain Above Anticipated	t-Ratio	p
2	9	1.48	.23	1.72	.37	2.17	.60	.69	3.96	.0005	+.45	2.60	.05
3	80	2.00	.46	2.46	.66	2.65	.67	.65	9.18	.0005	+.19	2.43	.01
4	68	2.49	.43	2.95	.58	3.10	.51	.61	11.87	.0005	+.15	2.63	.01
5	88	3.12	.78	3.57	.94	4.31	1.37	1.19	7.00	.0005	+.74	4.11	.01
6	56	3.77	.86	4.30	1.03	4.56	.87	.79	6.93	.0005	+.25	2.00	.05
7	30	4.40	.87	4.85	1.01	5.28	1.36	.88	5.61	.0005	+.43	2.69	.01
8	39	4.55	1.48	5.04	1.71	5.43	1.63	.88	5.80	.0005	+.39	2.43	.01
9	36	5.04	1.05	5.51	1.18	6.49	1.52	1.45	6.14	.0005	+.98	4.03	.01
Total	406	3.25	1.31	3.71	1.43	4.14	2.54	.89	8.20	.0005	+.43	3.92	.01

basis for determining student needs and planning for instructional purposes. Thus, the findings from the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test may more directly reflect the effects of program instruction on students' achievement in reading comprehension than do the findings from the comprehension section of the Metropolitan Reading Test.

In summary, the results of analyses of pre-and post-program comprehension scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test further support the conclusion that the District 24 Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Program was successful in achieving its first objective, to improve students' level of total reading achievement beyond that which would be expected from their previous reading performance.

2. Title I Total Group Results

The historical rate of growth method was used to assess growth in reading achievement in the Title I Program also, however, the procedure was modified to allow for the fact that this was a half-year instead of a full-year program. In order to avoid concealing the treatment impact by gains made during the September through December non-treatment period, an extrapolated pre-test score was calculated on the basis of the students' previous rate of growth. Then, employing the usual procedure, the child's anticipated post-test score was derived by multiplying his previous rate of growth by the number of months of corrective reading instruction and adding the result to his extrapolated pre-test score.

Table 14 presents the mean data and the results of tests of significance for Title I students' performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

TABLE 14

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR TITLE I STUDENTS' GAINS ABOVE ANTICIPATED ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST
(N=134)

Subtest	Actual Pre	Extrap. Pre	Antic. Post	Actual Post	Gain Above Antic.	t-Ratio	p
Word Knowledge	3.09	3.40	3.60	4.06	+.46	5.61	.01
Comprehension	3.17	3.48	3.69	4.15	+.46	5.70	.01
Total Reading	3.08	3.39	3.59	4.07	+.48	6.42	.01

Table 14 shows that program participants made gains of approximately four months above expected in the three areas measured, word knowledge, comprehension, and total reading. As the t-ratios show, these gains were all significant at the .01 level indicating that the program was effective in achieving the first objective, to improve pupils' level of reading achievement. In fact, when the actual pre-test and actual post-test scores are compared, we find that the Title I corrective reading students achieved approximately one year in each reading skill area during the total year from April, 1972 through April, 1973. The gains are comparable to those that would be expected from average readers during a regular school year.

3. Level of Retardation Group Results

The Corrective Reading Program in District 24 was structured so that elementary school students who were two or more years retarded in reading received three periods of instruction a week. Those who were less than two years retarded in reading received two periods of instruction a week. The two groups were compared to determine which group showed the greater gains in reading achievement.

Table 15 presents the number and percentage of more severely and less severely retarded readers in the Optional Assignment Program who obtained actual post-test scores above, the same as, and below their anticipated post-test scores on the *Metropolitan Achievement Test*.

TABLE 15

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT ELEMENTARY STUDENTS IN THE MORE SEVERELY AND LESS SEVERELY RETARDED GROUPS MAKING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS, AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED ON THE *METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST*

		WORD KNOWLEDGE			COMPREHENSION			TOTAL READING		
Group	N	Below	Same	Above	Below	Same	Above	Below	Same	Above
More Severely Retarded	173	43	6	124	70	12	91	53	17	103
(%)	(100)	(25)	(3)	(72)	(40)	(7)	(53)	(30)	(10)	(60)
Less Severely Retarded	110	36	5	69	48	5	57	37	6	67
(%)	(100)	(33)	(4)	(63)	(44)	(4)	(52)	(34)	(5)	(61)

As the data in Table 15 show, more pupils in each of the two groups made gains above anticipated in word knowledge than in reading comprehension. A greater percentage of the more severely retarded readers than the less severely retarded readers obtained gains above anticipated in word knowledge; however, about the same percentage in the two groups achieved gains above anticipated in comprehension (53 percent and 52 percent) and total reading achievement (60 percent and 61 percent).

Table 16 shows the means, gains, and the results of the tests of significance for the more severely and less severely retarded readers' performance on the two subtests and the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. There it can be seen that both groups obtained actual post-test scores above their anticipated post-test scores in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading. The t-ratios for the gains above anticipated reveal, however, that only the gains made by the more severely retarded readers are significant for all three areas. Although the gains above anticipated in word knowledge and total reading made by the less severely retarded readers were significant, their above anticipated gain in reading comprehension was not.

In summary, the t-ratios in Table 16 indicate that the program was more effective with the children who were more severely retarded in reading. This same trend was reported in last year's

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF GAINS OF MORE SEVERELY AND LESS SEVERELY RETARDED OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT ELEMENTARY STUDENTS ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

		Pre-Test		Antic. Post-Test		Actual Post-Test					Gain		
	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Actual Gain	t-Ratio	p	Above Antic.	t-Ratio	p
WORD KNOWLEDGE													
More Retarded	173	2.88	.66	3.45	.77	3.87	1.08	.99	14.73	.0005	.42	5.92	.0005
Less Retarded	110	3.27	.96	3.95	1.09	4.28	1.39	1.01	10.80	.0005	.33	3.16	.005
COMPREHENSION													
More Retarded	173	2.97	.82	3.55	.96	3.70	1.05	.73	11.42	.0005	.15	2.14	.05
Less Retarded	110	3.30	1.05	4.00	1.19	4.14	1.41	.84	9.53	.0005	.14	1.41	NS
TOTAL READING													
More Retarded	173	2.90	.69	3.47	.79	3.72	.97	.82	14.69	.0005	.25	4.16	.0005
Less Retarded	110	3.22	.93	3.90	1.03	4.16	1.34	.94	11.94	.0005	.26	3.05	.01

evaluation and it again suggests that the amount of improvement in reading is related directly to the amount of instructional time provided.

Growth in Reading Skills. The second objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program was to provide individualized instruction so that participants would increase their performance in specific reading skills. The measure used to evaluate this objective was the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Level I of this test was administered to participants in grades 2 through 4 and to some students in the higher grades whose previous reading achievement levels indicated this was the appropriate test. The Level II test was administered to children in grades 5 through 9. Pre-program scores on this test were made available to the Corrective Reading Teachers for use in diagnosing pupil weaknesses and planning instruction.

1. Optional Assignment Program Results

Table 17 presents the pre-to post-test gains for the Optional Assignment pupils on the Level I and Level II subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Examination of the data shows that gains on all subtests were highly significant ($p < .0005$).

TABLE 17

PRE-TO POST-TEST GAINS OF OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS ON THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

	Subtest	Pre-Test		Post-Test			t-
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Gain	Ratio*
				Level I Stanford (N=213)			
1.	Reading Comprehension	24.62	9.54	32.41	8.17	7.79	15.17
2.	Vocabulary	16.42	5.61	20.99	6.36	4.57	13.64
3.	Auditory Discrimination	26.98	11.41	34.14	9.42	7.16	10.73
4.	Syllabication	10.04	4.69	12.54	4.70	2.50	7.71
5.	Beginning and Ending Sounds	23.63	6.03	27.88	5.46	4.25	12.81
6.	Blending	19.14	9.37	26.98	7.30	7.84	17.41
7.	Sound Discrimination	14.13	6.93	20.02	7.65	5.89	12.15
				Level II Stanford (N=166)			
1.	(a) Literal Comprehension	15.17	4.27	18.42	4.40	3.25	10.67
	(b) Inferential Comprehen.	12.92	4.47	15.99	4.77	3.07	11.06
	(c) Total Comprehension	28.04	7.84	34.38	8.51	6.34	13.31
2.	Vocabulary	22.48	4.73	25.09	5.48	2.61	7.60
3.	Syllabication	15.01	4.02	17.04	3.56	2.03	7.81
4.	Sound Discrimination	18.77	6.29	21.97	6.33	3.20	7.50
5.	Blending	18.80	8.62	25.48	7.67	6.68	13.97
6.	Rate	16.56	8.46	19.43	8.54	2.87	3.86

*All t-ratios significant at .0005

In general, the younger children in the program (grades 2 to 4) made their largest gain in reading comprehension, blending and auditory discrimination as measured by the Level I Stanford Test. Least gains were made in the skill of syllabication. The older children in the program (grades 5 through 9) also showed their greatest gain in blending and their lowest gain in syllabication as measured by the Level II test. The findings reported in Table 17 may very well reflect program emphasis on instruction in basic word skills like blending.

In summary, the data in Table 17 support the conclusion that the program was effective at significantly increasing Optional Assignment pupils' specific reading skills. Although there was no control factor against which to compare the gains, the findings reported in the previous section on gains in reading achievement provide additional support for this conclusion since growth in total reading achievement is highly related to growth in specific reading skills.

2. Title I Program Results

The pre- to post-test Title I gains in specific reading skills are presented in Table 18 where, again, the t-ratios show that all Level I subtest gains were significant. These results indicate that the elementary school children in the Title I Program significantly improved their reading skills in each area

TABLE 18

PRE- TO POST-TEST TITLE I GAINS ON THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

Subtest	Pre-Test		Post-Test		Gain	t-Ratio*
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
			Level I Stanford (N=80)			
1. Reading Comprehension	23.44	10.33	32.36	8.16	8.92	11.11
2. Vocabulary	17.19	5.82	22.30	6.76	5.11	10.40
3. Auditory Discrimination	28.59	11.02	36.09	8.49	7.50	6.92
4. Syllabication	10.31	4.24	12.90	4.39	2.59	6.38
5. Beginning and Ending Sounds	23.21	8.41	28.30	5.26	5.09	6.34
6. Blending	19.45	9.31	25.68	8.29	6.23	11.40
7. Sound Discrimination	15.64	6.17	19.48	7.35	3.84	6.17
			Level II Stanford (N=37)			
1. (a) Literal Comprehen.	12.35	4.14	16.86	4.89	4.51	6.11
(b) Inferential Comp.	10.78	3.51	12.73	4.90	1.95	2.83
(c) Total Comprehen.	23.14	6.82	29.57	9.07	6.43	6.14
2. Vocabulary	16.08	5.06	19.97	6.05	3.89	4.93
3. Syllabication	12.05	3.97	13.76	3.29	1.71	2.81
4. Sound Discrimination	14.62	5.17	17.84	6.11	3.22	3.53
5. Blending	13.46	7.59	18.16	9.73	4.70	4.56
6. Rate	18.38	9.48	15.81	9.23	-2.57	1.21 NS

*All t-ratios significant at .01 except for the "Rate" t-ratio.

measured by the Level I Test as a result of the combined instruction provided in their regular classroom program and in the Corrective Reading Program. The pattern of gain is the same as that found for Optional Assignment students which indicates that the largest gains were made in reading comprehension, auditory discrimination and blending, and that the lowest gain was made in syllabication,

The students in the intermediate school also exhibited significant gains in the specific skill areas measured, with one exception. The exception was their achievement in reading rate. As Table 18 shows, the Title I students' post-program performance in this area was lower than their pre-program performance. From teacher reports, there is some indication that little emphasis is placed on reading rate in the instructional program. The data in Table 18 again points to the relatively high gain in the skill of blending and the relatively low gain in the skill of syllabication.

In summary, pre-to post-comparisons indicate that children in the Title I Program also increased their achievement in specific reading skills.

Improvement in Reading Attitude. The third objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase students' positive attitudes toward reading. This objective was assessed using pre- to post-program scores on the Index of Reading Attitude (see Appendix E). This scale is constructed so that the lower the child's score the more positive is his attitude toward reading.

1. Grade Level and Total Group Optional Assignment Results

Changes in Optional Assignment students' attitude toward reading at each grade level and for the total group are presented in Table 19.

TABLE 19

PRE- TO POST-PROGRAM CHANGE IN OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT STUDENTS' READING ATTITUDE*

Grade	N	Pre-Test Mean	Pre-Test SD	Post-Test Mean	Post-Test SD	Difference	t-Ratio**
3	68	37.49	9.95	39.35	8.87	+1.86	1.26
4	60	39.55	7.65	40.15	8.79	+0.60	0.59
5	81	41.06	8.38	39.76	8.49	-1.30	1.38
6	50	40.80	9.06	41.64	8.63	+0.84	0.69
7	20	40.25	8.25	40.20	9.12	-0.05	0.03
8	40	42.08	11.66	43.83	10.64	+1.75	1.42
9	25	44.24	7.36	47.04	9.33	+2.80	1.44
Total Group	345	40.32	9.17	41.03	9.18	+ .71	+1.46

*A decrease in the Reading Attitude Index score represents an improvement in reading attitude.

**No t-ratios are statistically significant at the .05 level.

The pre-to post-test mean differences in Table 19 show that only the children in grades 5 and 7 manifested some improvement in reading attitude as indicated by their lower post-program reading index mean scores. Participants at all the other grade levels, the third, fourth, sixth, eighth and ninth grades, exhibited attitudes toward reading at the end of the program that were somewhat less favorable than they were at the beginning of the program. All the t-ratios are not significant, however, which suggests that the changes in reading attitude at each grade level and for the total group, as measured by the Reading Attitude Index, were no greater than might have been expected by chance along.

The data in Table 19 support the conclusion that the Corrective Reading Program had little, if any, effect on Optional Assignment students' attitude toward reading and that, in fact, the program objective to develop students' positive attitudes toward reading was not achieved.

2. Title I Program Results

The change in reading attitudes among Title I participants is reported in Table 20 below.

TABLE 20

PRE/POST DIFFERENCE IN TITLE I STUDENTS'
READING ATTITUDE
(N=117)

Pre-Test Mean	SD	Post-Test Mean	SD	Difference*	t-Ratio	p
39.71	9.69	38.79	9.79	-.92	1.12	NS

*The lower the Reading Attitude Index score the more positive the child's reading attitude.

As seen in Table 20, program participants exhibited some improvement in their attitude toward reading; however, the mean difference of -.92 from the pre-to the post-test was not significant. This finding suggests that the Title I Corrective Reading Program also had little discernible effect on the improvement of students' attitude toward reading.

Impact of Paraprofessional Services. The final objective of the Corrective Reading Program in District 24 was to increase individualization of instruction through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading at the elementary level. In order to assess the impact of paraprofessional services on pupil growth in reading achievement and on improvement in reading attitude, the evaluation design called for children in the reimburseable Corrective Reading Program to be compared to children in a parallel corrective reading program that was supported by tax levy funds but which did not use the services of paraprofessionals. There was a change in the tax levy program and paraprofessionals were assigned to Corrective Reading Teachers in this program at the elementary schools in March of the school year. However, since this meant that the tax levy program included only one to one and a half months of service from the paraprofessionals before the post-tests were administered, compared to the seven months of service provided in the Optional Assignment Program, the decision was made to proceed with the proposed comparison.

In each elementary school where there was an Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Program, data also were collected for children in a similar tax levy program. The two groups of corrective reading students were compared using an analysis of covariance on their pre- and post-program total reading scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the grade level scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test and their scores on the Reading Attitude Index. The results of the analyses of variance are presented in Table 21.

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM
WITH TAX LEVY PROGRAM

Group	N	Pre Mean	Post Mean	Adj. Post	df	F-Ratio*
TOTAL READING (Metropolitan)						
O.A.	283	3.03	3.89	4.02	1/505	3.350
Tax Levy	225	3.30	4.31	4.15		
GRADE LEVEL SCORES (Stanford)						
O.A.	301	2.75	3.58	3.72	1/527	0.006
Tax Levy	229	3.13	3.90	3.71		
READING ATTITUDE						
O.A.	260	39.67	40.09	40.47	1/472	3.480
Tax Levy	215	41.77	42.39	41.92		

*No F-Ratio is statistically significant.

As expected, the Optional Assignment students exhibited lower mean scores than the tax levy children in reading achievement at the beginning of the program. However, their pre-test mean on the Reading Attitude Index suggests that their attitudes toward reading were slightly more positive than those of children in the tax levy program. Taking these initial group differences into account, the results of the analyses of covariance on each measure indicates that there were no significant differences between the two groups in reading achievement and attitude toward reading at the end of the program. The groups performed equally well on the post-tests.

The findings in Table 21 support the conclusion that the additional services provided by the paraprofessionals did not lead to significantly greater improvement in reading achievement and attitude toward reading. The reader should exercise caution, however, in interpreting this finding. Although the original program proposal called for paraprofessionals to serve in an instructional role assisting individual students and small groups, responses on Section C of the Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A) suggest that most teachers assigned paraprofessionals to roles that were not directly instructional in nature. These included preparation and organization of materials, supervising the distribution of audio-visual equipment and other materials, bookkeeping, filing and correcting student papers.

Although half of the teachers indicated that paraprofessionals also provided assistance to individuals and small groups, it is obvious that their role was not primarily instructional. According to the majority of the Corrective Reading Teachers, the paraprofessionals provided needed and much appreciated services. It is apparent, however, that if the program objective is to increase individualized instruction through the services of paraprofessionals, as a means of increasing student achievement in reading, then the paraprofessionals' primary role should include providing instruction under the guidance of the Corrective Reading Teacher. The implication is, of course, that paraprofessionals need adequate training for this role and the teachers need adequate training in working with paraprofessionals.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The summary and conclusions are arranged in an order corresponding to the presentation in the report.

Growth in Reading Achievement. The first objective of the full-year Optional Assignment Corrective Reading Program and the half-year Title I Program was to improve pupils' level of reading achievement beyond that expected from a regular classroom program. Pre-and post-program grade level scores on the Metropolitan Reading Test and on the comprehension section of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were used to determine if this objective was met. Based on each child's previous rate of growth, anticipated post-test scores were calculated and used as measures of how well the child would have achieved if he had not received special instruction in reading. At the end of the program, the children's actual post-test performance was compared to their anticipated performance to see if they had made gains significantly above those expected for them.

The data presented in the report support the conclusion that the Optional Assignment and Title I Corrective Reading Programs were generally successful in achieving the first objective. The following findings support this conclusion:

1. When actual post-test performance was compared to anticipated performance, 68 percent of the Optional Assignment children achieved gains higher than expected in word knowledge, 54 percent achieved gains higher than expected in reading compreehnsion, and 62 percent achieved above expected in total reading. Thus, more than half of the Optional Assignment students exceeded performance normally expected of them in each of the three areas measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Similar results obtained for the grade level score on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, indicating that 60 percent of the Optional Assignment students achieved gains above expected in reading comprehension.

2. Grade level comparisons showed that the word knowledge gains made by the Optional Assignment students were significantly above anticipated for all grade levels except the third grade. However, only the fifth, sixth, and ninth graders achieved gains significantly above those anticipated for them in reading comprehension. The fourth, seventh and eighth graders averaged post-test reading comprehension scores higher than expected but their gains were not significantly above those expected. The third graders achieved only at their expected rate of growth based on previous performance. The results indicate the program was more effective at developing Optional Assignment students' reading vocabulary than it was at developing skill in reading comprehension, as measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test.

3. On the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, all grade levels in the Optional Assignment Program, with the exception of the third and seventh grades, made gains significantly above those anticipated for them. This finding highlights further the weaknesses in the program at the third grade level.

4. Analysis of pre-to post-program scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test revealed that Optional Assignment students at all grade levels made average gains that were significantly above those anticipated for them in reading comprehension as measured by this test.

5. Comparison of total group pre-and post-program performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test showed that students in the half-year Title I Program made gains that were significantly above expected in word knowledge, comprehension, and total reading.

6. Comparisons of the gains of the more severely and less severely retarded elementary readers in the Optional Assignment Program revealed that approximately the same percentage of children in each group made gains above anticipated in comprehension and in total reading; however, a larger percentage of the more severely retarded readers achieved gains above anticipated in word knowledge.

7. Both groups, the more severely and less severely retarded readers, achieved gains significantly above anticipated in word knowledge and total reading; however, only the more severely retarded readers achieved significantly above anticipated in reading comprehension. There was evidence that the program was more effective with the more seriously retarded readers, suggesting a direct relation between amount of instruction and improvement in reading.

Growth in Specific Reading Skills. The second objective of the Optional Assignment and Title I Corrective Reading Programs was to provide diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction in order to increase pupils' ability in specific reading skills. Pre- and post-program scores on the Level I and Level II Stanford

Diagnostic Reading Test were used to evaluate this objective. The findings based on this test support the conclusion that the program objective was met. The findings were:

1. Optional Assignment students who were administered Level I and Level II of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test manifested significant gains in all skill areas measured.

2. Title I students exhibited significant pre-to post-program gains in all skill areas measured by the Level I Stanford, and in all areas, except one, that are measured by the Level II Stanford. The exception was in rate of reading where the intermediate school children achieved a post-test score that was lower, but not significantly different from their pre-test score.

Improvement in Reading Attitude. The third objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase students' positive attitudes toward reading. Pre-and post-program scores on the Reading Attitude Index were used to measure this objective. The data reported support the conclusion that both the Optional Assignment and the Title I Corrective Reading Programs did little to change program participants' attitudes toward reading and that, in fact, this program objective was not achieved.

Impact of Paraprofessional Services. The last objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase individualization of instruction through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading at the elementary level.

In order to assess the impact of paraprofessional services, Optional Assignment students in the reimburseable Corrective Reading Program were compared to students in a parallel tax levy corrective reading program which did not use the services of paraprofessionals. Using analyses of covariance, the two groups' pre-and post-program scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test and the Reading Attitude Index were compared. The findings that there were no significant differences in the performance of the two groups indicate that the additional services provided by the paraprofessionals did not lead to significantly greater improvement in reading achievement and attitude toward reading.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Again this year there was evidence that the Corrective Reading Program was generally effective in improving program participants' level of reading achievement. The recommendations which follow are made toward the goal of continued improvement of the program. It should be noted that many reemphasize recommendations previously made.

1. The repeated low achievement of third graders deserves careful study. This was the only grade level group that showed no significant gains above those expected for them based on previous performance.

2. There was evidence that the program was more effective in improving reading word knowledge than it was in developing reading comprehension skills. Every effort should be made to improve instruction in reading comprehension.

3. There was evidence that the more severely retarded readers made greater gains than the less severely retarded readers, suggesting that improvement in reading is directly related to the amount of instructional time. The staff should continue to make every effort to accurately assign the more severely retarded readers to the instructional groups that meet more frequently.

4. Continued use of more than one measuring instrument for selection and diagnosis is highly recommended.

5. Approximately one-third of the retarded readers still did not achieve at their expected rate of growth indicating that there are some weaknesses in providing appropriate instruction to all children in the program. Every effort should be made to determine the causes for this weakness as a basis for making improvements in the instructional program.

6. Continued effort is needed to select well trained teachers for the program which requires specialized skills in the teaching of reading. Specific criteria must be identified and used in Corrective Reading Teacher selection. If this is presently not possible, then there is evidence for the continuation of a strong inservice training program to upgrade the skills of the present staff.

7. If a program objective is to provide individualized instruction through the services of a paraprofessional as a means of improving students' reading achievement, then the role of the paraprofessional should be primarily an instructional one. To achieve this the paraprofessionals need specialized training in reading instruction and the teachers need training in working with paraprofessionals. If paraprofessionals are not used in instructional roles, then this aspect of the program should be reassessed.

8. There is again evidence that additional time is needed for the Corrective Reading Teacher to confer with parents and classroom teachers who should play a significant cooperative role in the resolution of reading problems.

9. The District 24 staff should continue to move in the direction of strengthening the developmental reading program so that the separate Corrective Reading Program can be phased out. The reading specialist in each school could then assume the role of a reading resource teacher in assisting classroom teachers with their reading program.

GUIDANCE SERVICES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

The objective of the guidance program for optional assignment pupils in District 24 during 1972-73 was to improve the behavior of pupils in academic and social skills.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In consonance with the program objective, the evaluation objective was:

Given pre-post-program teacher ratings of pupils' academic and social skills on the Behavior Checklist, students will manifest significant gains.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In order to assess gains in academic and social skills, it was necessary to develop the Behavior Checklist, determine the sample to be used, collect the data and analyze the data collected.

Development of the Behavior Checklist. The Behavior Checklist was developed by the evaluators to reflect those academic and social skills most characteristic of children in the age range of the optional assignment pupils (see Appendix A). In addition to providing data for the evaluation, the Checklist was designed to be of assistance to guidance counselors in their record keeping. Thus, the back of the Behavior Checklist provided a place to keep notes to which the counselors could readily refer in their work with pupils, parents and teachers.

Sample. All optional assignment pupils in the schools which had the services of guidance counselors from October through May were the subjects for the evaluation. There were 383 optional assignment pupils for whom pre-and post-program data were available. Of these, 191 were in three elementary schools, P.S. 153, P.S. 91 and P.S.87, and 192 were in one junior high school, J.H.S. 193. Comparisons were made between O.A. pupils who participated in counseling groups and those who did not. Numbers included 130 in the group category and 253 in the non-group category. For the comparison between O.A. pupils in corrective reading and those not in corrective reading, there were 167 in the former group and 216 in the latter.

A final comparison was made between a randomly selected number of O.A. pupils who had participated in groups and an equal number of resident pupils who had participated in groups. Since only 24 resident pupils participated in group counseling, an equal number of children from the O.A. group were selected on the basis of grade level and schools represented by the resident pupils in order to match the comparison groups as closely as possible.

Data Collection. Behavior Checklists were distributed by the guidance counselor to the classroom or homeroom teachers of all O.A. pupils and resident pupils who were participating in group counseling. The teacher returned a completed checklist for each student in early December and again in early May. Thus, the pre- post-comparisons were based on data from the two checklists for each pupil.

Treatment of the Data. A t-test for correlated data was computed on pre-and post- program ratings for each pupil. Comparisons were made between elementary and junior high pupils; optional assignment pupils in group and non-group counseling; O.A. pupils and resident pupils in groups; and, O.A. pupils in the Corrective Reading Program and O.A. pupils not in the Corrective Reading Program. The .05 level was considered minimal for statistical significance.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN OPERATION

The guidance program for Optional Assignment pupils in District 24 can best be described by discussing personnel involved, the actual program and operational problems.

Personnel. In the two elementary schools, the guidance counselors were assigned half-time to work with Optional Assignment pupils. Both counselors had been in the same schools during the previous year in similar assignments. In the two junior high schools, the counselor for O.A. pupils was assigned half-time to each school. Thus, he worked only with the O.A. pupils in those schools. He spent one full week in one school and the next week in the other school and repeated the pattern throughout the year. The junior high school counselor was new to the schools and to working with O.A. pupils.

In addition, a full-time Guidance Coordinator was employed throughout the year. The O.A. counselors and Coordinator met with the evaluators several times during the year.

Program. The counselors began working with the Coordinator early in the year to develop objectives for the guidance program. Problems identified in the 1971-72 evaluation report formed the basis for planning the group counseling program established during the 1972-73 year. Counselors were participants in training sessions under the leadership of Professor Arnold Buchheimer of C.U.N.Y. and conducted counseling groups throughout the year. Approximately one-half of the O.A. pupils participated in these groups, however, there were five times as many O.A. pupils in the groups as resident pupils. Most O.A. pupil counseling was done on an individual basis, as has been true in the past as well.

Operational Problems. Despite a real attempt to improve guidance services for Optional Assignment pupils, the most serious problem was the reduction in guidance staff during the course of the year. In September, there were seven O.A. counselors, servicing seven schools in the District. Services for O.A. pupils in P.S. 88, P.S. 71, P.S. 91 and J.H.S.'s 119 and 125 were discontinued during the course of the year, representing a discontinuance of special guidance services for approximately 500 children. The case load is especially high in J.H.S. 93 for a half-time counselor on a bi-weekly basis. Counselors expressed some difficulties encountered in scheduling pupils for group counseling sessions, especially in the junior high schools.

EFFECTS OF THE PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

This section of the report describes the results of the evaluation procedures. Included are analyses of pre- and post-test Behavior Checklist data, summaries and conclusions. All results relate to the objective of increasing academic skills and improving social skills of O.A. pupils, as perceived by classroom or home-room teachers. Correlated t-tests were used for all analyses.

Results for Total O.A.Group. In the academic skills of Reading, Math, Social Studies, Creative Expression and Science, the total group made significant gains. All increases were statistically significant at the .01 level. With regard to social skills, there were four areas of statistically significant increases in negative behaviors: "easily led by peers," "disrupting class," "being negative and aggressive toward authority," and "destroying property." There was a significant positive increase in "following directions." Table 1 shows the means, t-ratios and probability levels for these statistically significant areas.

TABLE 1

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL SKILLS FOR THE TOTAL O.A. GROUP
(N=383)

Category	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	P
Reading	+.53	8.19	.01
Math	+.37	5.88	.01
Social Studies	+.41	6.35	.01
Creative Expression	+.45	6.39	.01
Science	+.44	7.16	.01
Easily Led by Peers	+.43	3.48	.01
Disrupts Class	+.17	1.68	.05
Neg. & Aggress. to Authority	+.26	2.31	.05
Destroys Property	+.22	2.83	.01
Follows Directions	+.29	2.08	.05

Results for O.A.'s in Groups and O.A.'s Not in Groups. When O.A. pupils who participated in counseling groups were compared to O.A. pupils who did not participate in groups, the data showed that both sub-samples increased significantly in all academic skill areas. Ratings for O.A.'s in groups on the pre-rating were lower than for those not in groups; and, whereas significant gains were found for all, the pupils in groups showed greater gains. The data are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF GAIN IN ACADEMIC SKILLS FOR O.A. PUPILS IN COUNSELING GROUPS AND THOSE NOT IN COUNSELING GROUPS

O.A.'s in Groups

		PRE		POST				
Academic Skills	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	130	2.81	1.43	3.37	1.36	+.56	5.64	.01
Math	130	2.81	1.37	3.28	1.34	+.47	4.27	.01
Social Studies	130	2.92	1.38	3.38	1.24	+.46	4.16	.01
Creative Express. (art, music, writing)	130	2.89	1.47	3.38	1.23	+.49	4.27	.01
Science	130	2.90	1.39	3.41	1.21	+.51	4.21	.01

O.A.'s Not in Groups

		PRE		POST				
Academic Skills	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	253	3.28	1.38	3.79	1.41	+.51	6.13	.01
Math	253	3.24	1.41	3.55	1.40	+.31	4.14	.01
Social Studies	253	3.20	1.36	3.59	1.36	+.39	4.82	.01
Creative Express. (art, music, writing)	253	3.16	1.58	3.60	1.51	+.44	4.85	.01
Science	253	3.25	1.30	3.65	1.27	+.40	5.85	.01

In the social skills areas, the only significant difference for O.A. pupils who participated in groups was an increase in "destroys property." The mean difference was +.32, the t-ratio was 2.48, and the difference was statistically significant at the .01 level. For the pupils who did not participate in counseling groups, there were significant increases in all negative social skill areas and in "following directions." Data are presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL SKILL AREAS FOR O.A.
PUPILS NOT IN COUNSELING GROUPS
(N=253)

Category	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
Inattentive	+.27	2.03	.05
Easily Led By Peers	+.57	3.70	.01
Feelings Easily Hurt	+.28	2.07	.05
Disrupts Class	+.24	1.93	.05
Neg. & Aggress. to Authority	+.30	2.29	.05
Fights With Peers	+.24	1.72	.05
Destroys Property	+.17	1.72	.05
Follows Directions	+.39	2.28	.05

The comparison data indicate a definite trend favoring the group counseling approach.

Results for O.A.'s in Corrective Reading Compared With Those Not in Corrective Reading. In all of the academic skill areas, there were significant gains for both groups, with the Corrective Reading group making the most gains based on higher positive mean differences. Data are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF TEACHER RATINGS OF ACADEMIC SKILLS OF O.A. CHILDREN IN CORRECTIVE READING WITH THOSE NOT IN CORRECTIVE READING

O.A.'s in Corrective Reading

		PRE		POST				
Academic Skills	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	167	2.62	1.30	3.26	1.31	+.64	7.08	.01
Math	167	2.59	1.34	3.13	1.34	+.54	5.93	.01
Social Studies	167	2.57	1.33	3.19	1.24	+.62	5.90	.01
Creative Express. (art, music, writing)	167	2.65	1.40	3.19	1.32	+.54	4.62	.01
Science	167	2.72	1.27	3.26	1.16	+.54	5.44	.01

O.A.'s Not in Corrective Reading

		PRE		POST				
Academic Skills	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	216	3.51	1.38	3.95	1.40	+.44	4.90	.01
Math	216	3.48	1.34	3.72	1.36	+.24	2.80	.01
Social Studies	216	3.51	1.25	3.76	1.33	+.25	3.13	.01
Creative Express. (art, music, writing)	216	3.39	1.58	3.78	1.45	+.39	4.42	.01
Science	216	3.45	1.30	3.81	1.27	+.36	4.69	.01

In the social skill areas, there was a significant decrease for Corrective Reading children in the "feelings easily hurt" category. The mean difference was -.32; t-ratio was 1.78, and $p < .05$. For the O.A. children not in Corrective Reading, there were statistically significant increases in all negative areas. Neither group gained significantly in the positive areas. Data for the non-corrective reading group are shown in Table 5. The results of this analysis suggest a trend in favor of those children in the Corrective Reading Program.

TABLE 5

SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN NEGATIVE SOCIAL SKILLS FOR O.A. PUPILS NOT IN CORRECTIVE READING

Category	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
Inattentive	+.41	2.59	.01
Easily Led By Peers	+.53	3.39	.01
Feelings Easily Hurt	+.56	3.76	.01
Disrupts Class	+.27	1.94	.05
Negative & Aggress. to Authority	+.39	2.70	.01
Fights With Peers	+.34	2.24	.05

Results of Comparison Between O.A. Pupils in Elementary Grades and Those in Junior High Grades. Again, both elementary and junior high pupils made statistically significant gains in all academic skill areas, as rated by teachers. The data are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY O.A. PUPILS WITH JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL O.A. PUPILS ON ACADEMIC SKILLS

	Elementary			J.H.S.		
Category	Mean Diff.	t-Ratio	p	Mean Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	+.63	8.24	.01	+.43	4.13	.01
Math	+.45	5.57	.01	+.28	3.00	.01
Social Studies	+.54	6.31	.01	+.29	2.94	.01
Creative Exp.	+.57	6.39	.01	+.33	3.05	.01
Science	+.59	5.02	.01	+.28	3.25	.01
	(N=191)			(N=192)		

When examining social skills data for elementary pupils, there were significant decreases in the areas of "inattention" and "feelings easily hurt." Both were significant at the .01 level. For "inattentive," the mean difference was -.33; the t-ratio was 2.43. For "feelings easily hurt," the mean difference was -.43; the t-ratio was 2.82.

On the contrary, all negative social skills areas increased significantly for junior high O.A. pupils. One positive area, "follows directions," also increased significantly for this group. The data are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES FOR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL O.A. PUPILS IN SOCIAL SKILLS RATING (N=192)

Category	Mean Difference	t-Ratio	p
Inattentive	+ .68	3.79	.01
Easily Led By Peers	+1.02	5.99	.01
Feelings Easily Hurt	+ .79	4.83	.01
Disrupts Class	+ .34	2.19	.05
Neg. & Aggress. to Authority	+ .39	2.34	.01
Fights With Peers	+ .48	3.06	.01
Destroys Property	+ .27	2.73	.01
Follows Directions	+ .44	1.95	.05

Results of Comparison of O.A. Pupils in Groups With Residents in Groups. When a random sample of O.A. pupils in groups and resident pupils in groups were compared, all academic skills areas increased for both groups with the exception of science, which did not increase significantly for either. The statistically significant differences are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF O.A. PUPILS IN GROUPS WITH RESIDENTS IN GROUPS ON ACADEMIC SKILLS RATINGS

	O.A. (N=24)			Resident (N=24)		
Category	Mean Diff.	t-Ratio	p	Mean Diff.	t-Ratio	p
Reading	+.54	3.19	.01	+.33	1.88	.05
Math	+.41	2.00	.05	+.54	3.00	.01
Social Studies	+.29	1.57	.05	+.33	1.78	.05
Creative Exp.	+.41	1.74	.05	+.34	1.99	.05

When these same groups were compared in the social skills areas, only two statistically significant differences were found. For the O.A. pupils in groups, there was a significant decrease in the "easily led by peers" category. The mean difference was -.70; the t-ratio was 1.81; and the probability level was .05. For the resident pupils in groups, there was a statistically significant increase in the "inattentive" category. The mean difference was +.46; the t-ratio was 2.03; and the probability level was .05.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In examining the data, it was found that there were statistically significant increases in all academic skills areas in all comparisons made. Thus, teachers perceived Optional Assignment pupils and residents who participated in groups as having made gains in Reading, Math, Social Studies, Creative Expression and Science. The only exception was in the Science area for the comparison of O.A. pupils in counseling groups with resident pupils in counseling groups, where the gains were not statistically significant for either sub-group. It is also noteworthy that O.A. pupils who participated in counseling groups made greater gains than those who were not in counseling groups. The conclusion can be drawn that Optional Assignment pupils in District 24 increased their skills in academic areas, based upon ratings of the teachers who were most familiar with their work during the academic year. It can also be concluded that group counseling had an impact upon gains in academic skills.

In summarizing the data with regard to the social skills area, O.A. pupils' behaviors generally did not change in the desired direction. Whereas the negative social skill areas were hopefully to have decreased, in most cases there were generally more incidents of these behaviors at the end of the year than at the beginning. Whereas the positive social skills hopefully would have increased, there was not evidence of significant increases in most cases.

One significant set of results with regard to the counseling program was that, when the O.A. pupils who participated in counseling groups were compared to O.A. pupils who did not participate, the group participants increased significantly in only one negative area whereas the non-group participants increased in all seven negative areas. The conclusion can be drawn that group counseling contributed positively in the social skills area.

Another significant set of results can be seen when Corrective Reading pupils were compared to those not in Corrective Reading. The feelings of Corrective Reading participants were less easily hurt at the end of the year, and there were no increases in the negative areas. However, there were significant increases in all negative areas for pupils not in Corrective Reading. The conclusion can be drawn that the Corrective Reading program contributed positively in the social skills area.

Finally, the comparison of elementary and junior high school O.A. pupils yielded interesting results. Whereas all negative social skills areas increased for junior high pupils, as did the positive area of following directions, no areas increased for elementary pupils. In fact, teachers reported elementary pupils as becoming less inattentive and as having their feelings less easily hurt.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations, based on the data, are made for future consideration of District 24 personnel:

1. The group counseling aspect of the guidance program should be continued.
2. The Corrective Reading program should be continued.
3. Further study should be made of the relationship between the above two programs and social skill development.

The following recommendations, based on professional knowledge of the evaluators, are also made for future consideration:

1. The position of Coordinator should be maintained.
2. Guidance services for all O.A. pupils should be reinstituted.

APPENDIX A and B

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

PRE-KINDERGARTEN G.I.R. RATING SCALE

NAME: ______________________________ DATE: ______________________

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Usually	Always
A. Personal Care					
1. Can manage own	0	1	2	3	4
clothing (put on coat, hang up, tie laces, etc.).	0	1	2	3	4
2. Cares for self in toilet	0	1	2	3	4
3. Can handle food, liquids, and utensils properly.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Has coordination of small muscles.	0	1	2	3	4
B. Language Development					
1. Uses appropriate names of objects, places, and people.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Follows simple directions.	0	1	2	[illegible]	4
3. Uses complete sentences.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Converses with peers and adults.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Asks questions that show curiosity.	0	1	2	3	4

C. Manipulation of Materials

1. Experiments with materials.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Identifies and uses materials properly.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Works independently with materials.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Shows original expression through use of materials.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Uses a wide variety of material.	0	1	2	3	4

D. Intellectual

1. Identifies objects and events accurately.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Classifies objects, persons, and events properly.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Sees relationships between objects and their functions.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Uses logic processes in problem solving.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Remembers story and repeats in proper sequence.	0	1	2	3	4

E. Social and Emotional

1. Participates easily in small groups.	0	1	2	3	4
2. Exercises reasonable self-control.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Expresses emotions verbally.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Makes friends easily.	0	1	2	3	4
5. Satisfied with a reasonable amount of attention.	0	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B

PRE-KINDERGARTEN PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AND ATTITUDE SCALE

Please answer the following questions about your involvement and attitude concerning your child's school. It is not necessary for you to sign your name. Thank you.

INVOLVEMENT

	3 Quite a lot	2 Somewhat	1 Not at all
1. Have you discussed your child's progress with the teacher?	________	________	________
2. Have you attended parent meetings at the school?	________	________	________
3. Have you attended programs in which the children participated?	________	________	________
4. Have you talked with the educational assistant?	________	________	________
5. Have you observed in the program in your child's pre-kindergarten class?	________	________	________
6. Have you talked with the principal or the assistant principal?	________	________	________
7. Do you know what your child does in the pre-kindergarten program?	________	________	________

ATTITUDES

(NOTE: Please circle the number which most closely tells how you feel about each of the statements listed below.)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Most teachers probably like quiet children better than active ones.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
2.	As a parent there is little I can do to improve the schools.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Children in pre-kindergarten do not learn from playing in school.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Once in a while it should be OK for parents to keep their children out of school.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Teachers who are very friendly are not able to control the children.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Pre-kindergarten is not very helpful for children of this age.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	My child does not enjoy pre-kindergarten.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Most children have to be made to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I would rather have my child attend for a full day in a day care center than in the pre-kindergarten class.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX A through J

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT #24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

Strengthened Early Childhood Teacher Questionnaire

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for the Distar Teachers as a part of this year's program. We ask for an honest appraisal of this aspect of the program.

1. Instructions. Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the training sessions or in staff meetings. Use the rating scale below to evaluate the adequacy with which each area was covered during training sessions. Put your rating in the space provided before the topic. For any item that was not covered, write NC.

Scale: 5=Very Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not Covered

Rating	Topic
______	(a) Objectives and rationale for the programs
______	(b) Basic premises of the Distar programs
______	(c) Techniques for using Distar programs
______	(d) Instructions for using take homes
______	(e) Plan for grouping and regrouping
______	(f) Specific procedures for evaluating student progress
______	(g) Working with educational assistants
______	(h) Keeping records of individual progress
______	(i) Techniques for parent involvement

Rating		Topic
______	(j)	Learning activities for children not in groups
______	(k)	Voice and hand signals
______	(l)	Sequence of skill development in reading
______	(m)	Sequence of skill development in math
______	(n)	Sequence of skill development in language
______	(o)	Supplementary learning activities for children
		Other (Please specify) ____________________________
		____________________________

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Distar Teachers this year.

1. Unsatisfactory _____ 2. Barely satisfactory _____

3. Average _____ 4. Above Average _____

5. Very Satisfactory _____

4. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year (1971-72)?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1. _____ Inferior 2. _____ About the same 3. _____ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program and your suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - DISTAR TEACHER EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to the Distar Reading, Language, and Math in the Strengthened Early Childhood program. Use the following rating scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very satisfactory, NA=Not applicable

Program Organization

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating	Item
______	______	______	(a) Size of classroom group
______	______	______	(b) Size of small instructional groups
______	______	______	(c) Number of adults in classroom
______	______	______	(d) Amount of time devoted to program
______	______	______	(e) Procedures for recycling or regrouping children
______	______	______	(f) Structure of Distar Programs
______	______	______	(g) Overall Rating for Program Organization

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of classroom

______ (b) Physical facilities in classroom

______ (c) Distar kits

______ (d) Teacher's Guides

______ (e) Instructional materials (presentation)

______ (f) Student materials (take homes, etc.)

______ (g) Supplementary practice materials

______ (h) Collection of children's literature

______ (i) Availability of materials at start of program

______ (j) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Program Operation

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating	
______	______	______	(a) Management of groups
______	______	______	(b) Record keeping
______	______	______	(c) Sequencing of skill development
______	______	______	(d) Pacing of new skills introduced
______	______	______	(e) Overall Rating for Program Operation

Program Effectiveness

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating	
______	______	______	(a) Student enthusiasm for programs
______	______	______	(b) Student progress in skill acquisition
______	______	______	(c) Student progress in application of skills
______	______	______	(d) Student independent reading, language, math activity
______	______	______	(e) Overall Rating for Program Effectivenes

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Parents' knowledge of Distar programs

______ (b) Extent of parental involvement in program

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (d) Time for parent conferences

______ (e) Overall Rating for Parental Involvement & Attitude

Personnel Support

______ (a) Support of principal for program

______ (b) Helpfulness of bilingual community liaison

______ (c) Assistance from early childhood coordinator

______ (d) Help from guidance counselor

______ (e) Overall Rating for Personnel Support

2. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Distar Program is:

1. ________ Inferior 2. ______________ About the same 3. ________ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item #1 above.)

____

____

____

5. What other approaches to early childhood education would you like to have considered in District #24?

____

____

____

SECTION C - DISTAR TEACHER EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

1. Paraprofessionals

(a) How many paraprofessionals were assigned to your classroom?

(b) Could you have used additional paraprofessionals?

Yes ___ No _____

(c) What date did they begin working?______________________

(d) Did the paraprofessionals receive any special training for the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, who provided the training?______________________

____

(e) Briefly describe responsibilities assumed by the paraprofessional(s) in your program.

__________________________ __________________________

__________________________ __________________________

__________________________ __________________________

(f) Please rate the adequacy of the paraprofessionals' preparation and skills for the program.

1 ________	2 ________	3 ______	4 ________
Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average
5 ________			
Very Satisfactory			

(g) What is your overall rating of the services provided by the paraprofessionals?

1 ________	2 ________	3 ______	4 ________
Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average
5 ________			
Very Satisfactory			

(h) Indicate your suggestions for improving the contributions that can be made by paraprofessionals in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program.

____

____

____

2. Guidance Services for Strengthened Early Childhood

(a) Approximately how many of your students received the services of the guidance counselor? ________________

(b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Regularly

(c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

1	2	3	4	5
Not helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful

(d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for students in the Strengthened Early Childhood program?

____

____

____

3. Bilingual Community Liaison for SEC Program

(a) English is a second language for approximately how many of your students? __________

(b) Approximately how many of your students and/or their parents had contacts with the bilingual community liaison?

____

(c) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the bilingual community liaison?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Regularly

(d) How would you rate the quality of the services provided by the bilingual community liaison?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful

(e) What suggestions do you have for improving the bilingual community liaison services?

____

____

____

SECTION D - DISTAR TEACHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Year	Institution	Major Field

2. TEACHING LICENSE(s)	YEAR GRANTED

3. Course Work Relevant to Teaching Reading, Language and Math. List specific courses you have taken (and indicate the college and year) which are related to teaching reading, language or math to young children. (Not inservice courses.)

Courses	Institution	Year

4. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

School	Grades	No. of Years	Regular or Substitute

5. INSERVICE COURSES

List the inservice courses you have taken.

Course	Year

APPENDIX B

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT #24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD PARAPROFESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for paraprofessionals in the Distar Program. Please give your candid appraisal.

1. Instructions. Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the training sessions or in staff meetings. Use the rating scale below to evaluate the adequacy with which each area was covered during training sessions. Put your rating in the space provided before the topic. For any item that was not covered, write NC.

Scale: 5=Very Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not Covered

Rating	Topics
______	(a) Objectives and rationale for the programs
______	(b) Basic premises of the Distar programs
______	(c) Techniques for using Distar programs
______	(d) Instructions for using take homes
______	(e) Plan for grouping and regrouping
______	(f) Specific procedures for evaluating student progress
______	(g) Working with classroom teachers
______	(h) Keeping records of individual progress
______	(i) Techniques for parent involvement
______	(j) Learning activities for children not in groups
______	(k) Voice and hand signals

Rating		Topics
_____	(l)	Sequence of skill development in reading
_____	(m)	Sequence of skill development in language
_____	(n)	Sequence of skill development in math
_____	(o)	Supplementary learning activities for children
		Other (Please specify)____________________________
		____

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Distar Paraprofessionals this year.

1. Unsatisfactory _____ 2. Barely Satisfactory _____

3. Average _____ 4. Above Average _____

5. Very Satisfactory _____

4. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year (1971-72)?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1. ________ Inferior 2. ______________ About the same 3. ________ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program and your suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - PARAPROFESSIONAL EVALUATION OF DISTAR PROGRAM

1. Listed below are items related to the Distar Reading, Language and Math in the Strengthened Early Childhood program. Use the following rating scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory, NA=Not Applicable

Program Organization

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating		Item
______	______	______	(a)	Size of classroom group
______	______	______	(b)	Size of small instructional groups
______	______	______	(c)	Number of adults in classroom
______	______	______	(d)	Amount of time devoted to program
______	______	______	(e)	Procedures for recycling or regrouping children
______	______	______	(f)	Structure of Distar Programs
______	______	______	(g)	Overall Rating for Program Organization

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of classroom

______ (b) Physical facilities in classroom

______ (c) Distar kits

______ (d) Teacher's Guides

______ (e) Instructional materials (presentation)

______ (f) Student materials (take homes, etc.)

______ (g) Supplementary practice materials

______ (h) Collection of children's literature

______ (i) Availability of materials at start of program

______ (j) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Program Operation

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating		
______	______	______	(a)	Management of groups
______	______	______	(b)	Record keeping
______	______	______	(c)	Sequencing of skill development
______	______	______	(d)	Pacing of new skills introduced
______	______	______	(e)	Overall Rating for Program Operation

Program Effectiveness

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating		
______	______	______	(a)	Student enthusiasm for programs
______	______	______	(b)	Student progress in skill acquisition
______	______	______	(c)	Student progress in application of skills
______	______	______	(d)	Student independent reading, language, math activity
______	______	______	(e)	Overall Rating for Program Effectiveness

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Parents' knowledge of Distar programs

______ (b) Extent of parental involvement in program

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (d) Time for parent conferences

______ (e) Overall Rating for Parental Involvement & Attitude

Personnel Support

______ (a) Support of principal for program

______ (b) Helpfulness of bilingual community liaison

______ (c) Assistance from early childhood coordinator

______ (d) Help from guidance counselor

______ (e) Overall Rating for Personnel Support

2. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year?

   1. No _____   2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Distar Program is:

   1. ________ Inferior   2. ______________ About the same   3. ________ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

   1. Yes _____   2. No _____   3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item #1 above.)

____

____

____

5. What other approaches to early childhood education would you like to have considered in District #24?

____

____

____

____

SECTION C - PARAPROFESSIONAL EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

1. Guidance Services for Strengthened Early Childhood

   (a) Approximately how many of your students received the services of the guidance counselor? ______________

   (b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Regularly

   (c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

1	2	3	4	5
Not helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful

   (d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for students in the Strengthened Early Childhood program?

   ____

   ____

   ____

SECTION D - PARAPROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

   (a) Highest grade attended ______________________

   (b) Amount of college work ______________________

   (c) Are you taking college courses now? ______________

   (d) Do you speak any language other than English? ________

   If yes, which languages? ______________________

2. EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

(a) How many years, including this one, have you worked as an educational assistant? ________

(b) How many years, including this one, have you worked at this school? ______

(c) What related positions have you held that contribute to your present work? ____________________________

____

____

3. INSERVICE COURSES

List the inservice courses you have taken.

Course	Year
______________________________	______________
______________________________	______________
______________________________	______________
______________________________	______________

APPENDIX C

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT #24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

Strengthened Early Childhood Coordinator Questionnaire

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for the Distar Teachers as a part of this year's program. We ask for an honest appraisal of this aspect of the program.

1. Instructions. Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the training sessions or in staff meetings. Use the rating scale below to evaluate the adequacy with which each area was covered during training sessions. Put your rating in the space provided before the topic. For any item that was not covered, write NC.

   Scale: 5=Very Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not Covered

Rating	Topic
______	(a) Objectives and rationale for the programs
______	(b) Basic premises of the Distar programs
______	(c) Techniques for using Distar programs
______	(d) Instructions for using take homes
______	(e) Plan for grouping and regrouping
______	(f) Specific procedures for evaluating student progress
______	(g) Working with educational assistants
______	(h) Keeping records of individual progress
______	(i) Techniques for parent involvement
______	(j) Learning activities for children not in groups

Rating Topics

______ (k) Voice and hand signals

______ (l) Sequence of skill development in reading

______ (m) Sequence of skill development in language

______ (n) Sequence of skill development in math

______ (o) Supplementary learning activities for children

Other (Please specify) ______________________________

____

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Distar Teachers this year.

1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely satisfactory ___

3. Average ___ 4. Above Average ___ 5. Very Satisfactory ___

4. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year (1971-72)?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1. ________ Inferior 2. ______________ About the same 3. ________ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program and your suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - DISTAR COORDINATOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to the Distar Reading, Language and Math in the Strengthened Early Childhood program. Use the following rating scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory, NA=Not Applicable

Program Organization

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating		Item
			(a)	Size of classroom group
			(b)	Size of small instructional groups
			(c)	Number of adults in classroom
			(d)	Amount of time devoted to program
			(e)	Procedures for recycling or regrouping children
			(f)	Structure of Distar Programs
			(g)	Overall Rating for Program Organization

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of classroom

______ (b) Physical facilities in classroom

______ (c) Distar kits

______ (d) Teacher's Guides

______ (e) Instructional materials (presentation)

______ (f) Student materials (take homes, etc.)

______ (g) Supplementary practice materials

______ (h) Collection of children's literature

______ (i) Availability of materials at start of program

______ (j) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Program Operation

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating	
______	______	______	(a) Management of groups
______	______	______	(b) Record keeping
______	______	______	(c) Sequencing of skill development
______	______	______	(d) Pacing of new skills introduced
______	______	______	(e) Overall Rating for Program Operation

Program Effectiveness

Reading Rating	Language Rating	Math Rating	
______	______	______	(a) Student enthusiasm for programs
______	______	______	(b) Student progress in skill acquisition
______	______	______	(c) Student progress in application of skills
______	______	______	(d) Student independent reading, language, math activity
______	______	______	(e) Overall Rating for Program Effectiveness

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Parents' knowledge of Distar programs

______ (b) Extent of parental involvement in program

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (d) Time for parent conferences

______ (e) Overall Rating for Parental Involvement & Attitude

Personnel Support

______ (a) Support of principal for program

______ (b) Helpfulness of bilingual community liaison

______ (c) Willingness of teachers to meet program demands

______ (d) Help from guidance counselor

______ (e) Willingness of paraprofessionals to meet program demands

______ (f) Overall Rating for Personnel Support

2. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Distar Program is:

1. ________ Inferior 2. ______________ About the same 3. ________ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item #1 above).

____

____

____

5. What other approaches to early childhood education would you like to have considered in District #24?

____

____

____

SECTION C - DISTAR COORDINATORS EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

1. Paraprofessionals

(a) How many paraprofessionals were assigned to your school?

____

(b) Could you have used additional paraprofessionals?

Yes ___ No ___

(c) What date did they begin working? ________________________

(d) Did the paraprofessionals receive any special training for the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, who provided the training? ________________________

____

(e) Briefly describe responsibilities assumed by the paraprofessional(s) in your program.

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

(f) Please rate the adequacy of the paraprofessionals' preparation and skills for the program.

1 ________ Inadequate

2 ________ Barely Satisfactory

3 ________ Satisfactory

4 ________ Above Average

5 ________ Very Satisfactory

(g) What is your overall rating of the services provided by the paraprofessionals?

1 ________ Unsatisfactory

2 ________ Barely Satisfactory

3 ________ Average

4 ________ Above Average

5 ________ Very Satisfactory

(h) Indicate your suggestions for improving the contributions that can be made by paraprofessionals in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program.

____

____

____

2. Guidance Services for Strengthened Early Childhood

(a) Approximately how many of your students received the services of the guidance counselor? ________________

(b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Regularly

(c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

1	2	3	4	5
Not helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful

(d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for students in the Strengthened Early Childhood program?

____

____

____

____

3. Bilingual Community Liaison for SEC Program

(a) English is a second language for approximately how many of your students? ______

(b) Approximately how many of your students and/or their parents had contacts with the bilingual community liaison? ________

(c) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the bilingual community liaison?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Regularly

(d) How would you rate the quality of the services provided by the bilingual community liaison?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful

(e) What suggestions do you have for improving the bilingual community liaison services?

SECTION D - DISTAR COORDINATOR BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Year	Institution	Major Field

2. TEACHING LICENSE(s)	YEAR GRANTED

3. Course Work Relevant to Teaching Reading, Language and Math. List specific courses you have taken (and indicate the college and year) which are related to teaching reading, language or math to young children. (Not inservice courses.)

Courses	Institution	Year

4. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

School	Grades	No. of Years	Regular or Substitute

5. INSERVICE COURSES

List the inservice courses you have taken.

Course	Year

APPENDIX D

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

PRINCIPALS'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ______________________________________ Date ______________

School______________________________________

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluating the program and for making recommendations for improvement. No person connected with the school or the Board of of Education will have access to these data.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for Distar Teachers as part of this year's program. Please answer to the best of your knowledge.

1. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Don't Know _____

2. Give your overall rating of the adequacy of the inservice training that was provided for Distar Teachers.

   1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely Satisfactory ___

   3. Average ___ 4. Above Average ___ 5. Very Satisfactory ___

   (DK) Don't Know ____

3. How would you evaluate this year's inservice training program in comparison to last year's. On the whole, this year's training was:

   1______ Inferior 2____________ About the same 3______ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided for teachers in the Distar Program.

____

____

____

SECTION B - PRINCIPALS EVALUATION OF DISTAR PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Instructions. Listed below are items related to aspects of the Distar Program. Use the following scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of these aspects of the program.

Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average,
4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory, NA=Not applicable

Program Organization

Rating Item

______ (a) Size of classroom groups

______ (b) Number of adults per classroom

______ (c) Amount of instructional time devoted to program

______ (d) Overall Rating for Program Organization

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of classrooms for number of students
Exceptions: ____________________

______ (b) Physical facilities in classrooms
Exceptions: ____________________

______ (c) Quantity of Distar materials supplied

______ (d) Distribution of Distar materials

______ (e) Collections of children's literature in classroom or library

Rating Item

______ (f) Availability of materials at start of program

______ (g) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Program Operation

______ (a) Management of groups

______ (b) Record keeping

______ (c) Shared teaching by teacher and paraprofessionals

______ (d) Overall Rating for Program Operation

Program Effectiveness

______ (a) Student enthusiasm for programs

______ (b) Student progress in phonics skills

______ (c) Student progress in reading comprehension

______ (d) Student progress in language development

______ (e) Student progress in math skills

______ (f) Student independent reading and math activity

______ (g) Overall Rating for Program Effectiveness

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Parents' knowledge of Distar programs

______ (b) Extent of parental involvement in program

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (d) Number of teacher-parent conferences

______ (e) Overall Rating for Parental Involvement & Attitude

Personnel Support

Rating		Item
______	(a)	Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively in the program
______	(b)	Helpfulness of bilingual community liaison
______	(c)	Assistance from early childhood coordinator
______	(d)	Help from guidance counselor
______	(e)	Teacher attitude toward quality of service provided by paraprofessionals
______	(f)	Overall Rating for Personnel Support

2. How would you compare the overall effectiveness and operation of this year's Distar Program with last year's? This year's program is:

1 ______ Inferior

2 ______ About the same

3 ______ Superior

3. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above).

____

____

____

____

What other approaches to early childhood education would you like to have considered in District 24?

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX E

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

GUIDANCE COUNSELOR QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

1. Have you observed any inservice training sessions for teachers or paraprofessionals in the Distar Program? ________________
If so, how would you rate the adequacy of the training?

1 ______	2 ______	3 ______	4 ______	5 ______
Inferior	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Superior

SECTION B - GUIDANCE COUNSELOR'S EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to the Distar Reading, Language and Math in the Strengthened Early Childhood Program. Use the following rating scale to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

Program Organization

Rating — Item

______ (a) Size of classroom groups

______ (b) Size of small instructional groups

______ (c) Number of adults in classroom

______ (d) Amount of time devoted to program

______ (e) Children's knowledge of established routines

______ (f) Structure of program facilitates interaction

______ (g) Overall Rating for Program Organization

Physical Facilities and Materials

Rating Item

______ (a) Size of classrooms for number of students
Exceptions: ______________________

______ (b) Physical facilities in classrooms
Exceptions: ______________________

______ (c) Safety and health factors in classrooms

______ (d) Stimulating learning environment

______ (e) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Program Operation

______ (a) Stimulation of children's intellectual development

______ (b) Accommodation for children's emotional needs

______ (c) Encouragement of children's social development

______ (d) Consideration for children's physical development

______ (e) Teachers' management of groups

______ (f) Shared teaching by teacher and paraprofessional

______ (g) Overall Rating for Program Operation

Program Effectiveness

______ (a) Student enthusiasm for program

______ (b) Emotional stability of students

______ (c) Physical maturity of students in relation to program demands

______ (d) Social interaction of students

______ (e) Cognitive responses of students to program

______ (f) Incidence of behavioral problems in students

______ (g) Overall Rating for Program Effectiveness

Parental Involvement and Attitudes

Rating Item

______ (a) Parents' knowledge of Distar programs

______ (b) Extent of parental involvement in program

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (d) Time for parent conferences

______ (e) Parental cooperation in resolution of children's problems

______ (f) Overall Rating for Parental Involvement and Attitude

Personnel Support

______ (a) Support of principal for program

______ (b) Helpfulness of bilingual community liaison

______ (c) Assistance from early childhood coordinator

______ (d) Cooperation of classroom teacher in resolution of children's problems

______ (e) Overall Rating for Personnel Support

2. Did you participate in the Distar Program last year?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Distar Program is:

   1 ______ Inferior 2 ______ About the same 3 ______ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

   1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above.)

5. What other approaches to early childhood education would you like to have considered in District 24?

APPENDIX F

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD BEHAVIORAL CHECKLIST
DISTRICT 24

To be completed by classroom teacher:

Pupil's Name____________________Grade_____Age_____Teacher_________

School__________________________Distar____Non-Distar_____________

Compared to the rest of the children in your class, please rate the above-named student on the following characteristics. Check appropriate rating.

Academic Skills	Needs Improvement	Fair	Good	Excellent
Reading				
Math				
Social Studies/Science				
Creative Expression				
(Art, music, writing)				

Behaviors (As observed during past month)	Approximate number of times observed 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Inattentive								
Follows directions								
Completes tasks								
Easily led by peers								
Short Attention Span								

Behaviors (continued)	Approximate number of times observed							
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disrupts class								
Negative and aggressive to authority								
Prefers to be alone								
Fights with peers								
Destroys property								
Asks for help								
Day dreams								
Cries easily								
Masturbates								
Wanders around the room								
Withdraws from group								
Appears lethargic								
Bites fingernails, lower lip								

Please specify other problem characteristics this student exhibits

____

____

____

____

To be completed by Guidance Counselor:

Attendance Record:

Dates of individual contacts with child:

Dates of home visits: (by paraprofessional, social worker, teacher, counselor)

Dates of contact with classroom teacher:

Dates of telephone contacts with parents:

APPENDIX G

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

ANDERSON OBSERVATIONAL INSTRUMENT
Observation Form*

School__________________________Teacher_______________________________

Time__________to______________Date_____________Videotaper________

Directions: Please complete by placing a tally in the appropriate category for each behavior viewed.

Categories	Tallies
1. Determines a detail of activity or acts for the child in carrying out a detail	
2. Direct refusal	
3. Relocating, reseating, or placing children in different relation to each other or to property, ie., different from the relation which the children have themselves selected	
4. Postponing, slowing up the child	
5. Disapproval, blame or obstruction	
6. Warning, threats, or conditional promises	
7. Call to attention or to group activity	
8. Rations material	
9. Lecture method	

Categories	Tallies
10. Question: Lecture method	
15. Perfunctory question or statement	
16. Approval	
17. Accepts difference	
18. Extends invitation to activity	
19. Question or statement regarding child's expressed interest or activity	
20. The build-up	
21. Participates in joint activity with children	
22. Sympathy	
23. Permission	

* Description of Each Category of The Anderson Observational Instrument

1. **Determines a detail of activity or acts for the child in carrying out a detail**

   Includes instances where T (teacher) in order to rush through to an end, goes ahead and does things for the child.

   T: "I'm going to sing you a song."
   "You listen so you will know it."
   "You will have to fold yours like this."
   "I'll get you another handle."
   "I'll put the names on the baskets."
   "All right, we won't play that game any more."
   "I thought you would like to make some baskets to take home."

2. **Direct refusal**

   T answers "No" to a direct request.

3. **Relocating, reseating, or placing children in different relation to each other or to property, ie., different from the relation which the children have themselves selected**

   T: "Henry, Janet, Sam, please sit down."
   (Later, T: "I don't want to speak to Henry, Sam, and Janet again." Check each child for category 6, warning, threat.)

4. **Postponing, slowing up the child**

   T: "Not now."
   "Wait just a minute."
   "Later on."
   "Sometime soon."
   "Tomorrow."
   "In a few minutes."
   Holds back the fast ones.
   Obstructs differentiation, originality, individual differences, variability within the group.
   T: "Betty Lou, go back and wait until I come around."
   "Wait at your place until I give you one."

(Note: The question as to how much waiting or "organization" was necessary for the conduct of the group gave the experimenters some difficulty at first. But the question was an ethical question, not scientifically descriptive. The objective problem was what could be observed and recorded reliably.

Sally had just finished pasting. S: "I've got to wash my hands." The toilet and washroom were just behind the place where she was sitting. It was built for the special use of the children in that particular room and was inaccessible from outside the room.

T: "Just a minute, Sally, and we will all go and wash our hands." Following which, S. was obliged to stand in line and wait her turn.

5. Disapproval, blame or obstruction

"Hurry up," implying disapproval.
"I'm waiting."
"one little boy-I don't see his eyes at all." Check "unidentified."
Pete was not listening, did not know what T had said:
T: "I didn't think you would know."
T had asked them all to place their finished baskets in the middle of the table and not to play with them.
T: "Somebody forgot not to play with their basket."
(Check "unidentified.")
(Note: the overlapping between the holding back of the fast ones in category 4 and the stronger environmental pressure of obstructing with an added implication of blame or disapproval in category 5.)

6. Warning, threats, or conditional promises

T: "I don't want to speak to Henry, Sam, and Janet again."
T: "Now if we all sit nicely and keep our hands to ourselves, we might have two stories."

7. Call to attention or to group activity

The bugle call: sounding a certain chord on the piano.
T: "Girls and boys,"
T: "Let's see who is listening."

8. Rations material

T makes decisions as to amount, kind, etc. e.g., amount of paste, amount of grass for rabbit nests.

(Implication is that rationing of materials is psychologically more than an administrative convenience; it deprives the child of an opportunity to exercise his own judgment, to decide for himself, how much it will take for the job at hand; and, for this reason, it is an expression of T domination.)

9. Lecture method

T gratuitously defines a problem or anticipates the question and gives the answer.

T, passing out paper:

T: "The paper is to keep the paste off the tables."

(If there was a problem of keeping the paste off the tables, the children might have contributed from their experiences in defining the problem, especially since only the children got paste on the table.1 As a matter of fact, the tables were made so that paste could be washed off.)

T: "You won't need your scissors." (Check No. 9)

(But) "Don't get your scissors." (Check No. 1)

10. Questions: Lecture method

Questions for which the answers are only in the back of the book or in the teacher's experience.

T: "What did the birdie say?"

If there is only one answer, then check No. 10. If the child is permitted to give an imaginative answer, then check under No. 19 or No. 20.

(Categories 11 to 14, inclusive, deleted on the blank.)

15. Perfunctory question or statement

Indifferent "Thank you's"

T: "Isn't that interesting?" -a bare response, but a response nevertheless.

T: "Is that so?"

Disregard perfunctory remarks when they are combined with something else representing a stronger response, e.g., child has finished basket. Says: "Isn't my basket cute?"

T: "Yes, but we haven't got it all pasted. The decorations are not on." The "Yes" is regarded as perfunctory, but not checked. The remainder of the statement is checked as No. 5, "disapproval."

16. Approval

Includes rewards, prizes, competitive favors.

T: "I think that's fine."

"That's fine."

"Billy's row is standing the straightest."

17. Accepts difference

Observer must be alert for negative votes, declinings, expressions of difference, conflicts of difference. Whenever the T makes an offer or gives an invitation, and the child declines, some category should be checked for T's response: She either accepts the difference (No. 17); or she reproves (No. 5); or she renews her request (No. 18).

T: "Jimmy, would you like to sing this one (song) up here (beside T)?" Jimmy declines.

T turns to another child.

(Check rank order for Jimmy, No. 18, Extends invitation; check the other child, rank order for No. 18; check Jimmy for No. 17, Accepts difference.)

18. Extends invitation to activity

"Who wants to be a pony?"

"Who would like to be a robin?"

Call for a show of hands. The choice rests with the children. It must be obvious that there is no element of exhortation and that a child can still decline. Under few circumstances will an invitation be made more than twice without obvious attempts to exhort; in which case check No. 1. A teacher's contact in category No. 1 cannot be declined without further exhortation or disapproval.

19. Question or statement regarding child's expressed interest or activity

Carries no presumption of opposition, antagonism, disapproval, or urging.

"Dickie, are you waiting for paste?"

"How are you getting along?"

Includes the ice-breaker conversation.

"Do you have a dog at home?"

20. The build-up

Highly integrative behavior.

Includes instances where T helps child to arrive at a better definition of a problem or a better solution without giving the final answer.

If the final answer is given, the teacher's response is checked as No. 9 or No. 10.

T: "Look at your feet. Are you sure you have the right foot? Is your rubber on the right foot?"

21. Participates in joint activity with children

Offers help, offers to participate.

Children playing ball. Ball rolls over near T, who returns it.

22. Sympathy

T: "I'm sorry you hurt your finger."

23. Permission

T grants child's request.
"May I get a drink?"
"May I pass the cookies?"

Undetermined

Contacts were recorded as undetermined when the observer could not immediately classify the contact in one of the above categories. Undetermined contacts usually occurred when the observer could not hear the teacher's remarks, see her action, or decide whether the teacher was making a command or a request.

APPENDIX H

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

TEACHERS' ESTIMATION FORM

School____________Teacher____________________________

Time______to_____Date_________Videotaper_______________

Directions: Please complete by estimating the percentage of time you generally spend in each activity during the "free play and work time." You need not enter an estimate in each category, but your total estimates should equal 100%.

Categories	Estimated % of Time Spent in Activity
1. Determines a detail of activity or acts for the child in carrying out a detail	1.
2. Direct refusal	2.
3. Relocating, reseating, or placing children in different relation to each other or to property, i.e., different from the relation which the children have themselves selected	3.
4. Postponing, slowing up the child	4.
5. Disapproval, blame, or obstruction	5.
6. Warning, threats, or conditional promises	6.

Categories	Estimated % of time spent in activity
7. Call to attention or to group activity	7.
8. Rations material	8.
9. Lecture method	9.
10. Question: Lecture method	10.
15. Perfunctory question or statement	15.
16. Approval	16.
17. Accepts difference	17.
18. Extends invitation to activity	18.
19. Question or statement regarding child's expressed interest or activity	19.
20. The build-up	20.
21. Participates in joint activity with children	21.
22. Sympathy	22.
23. Permission	23.
Undetermined	

APPENDIX I

STRENGTHENED EARLY CHILDHOOD - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center For Field Research and School Services

PARENTAL ATTITUDE AND INVOLVEMENT SCALE

Your child's Room No. _____ School _______ Date _______

Please answer the following questions about your involvement and attitude concerning your child's school. It is not necessary for you to sign your name. Thank you.

	INVOLVEMENT		
	3 Quite a lot	2 Somewhat	1 Not at all
1. Have you discussed your child's progress with the teacher?			
2. Have you attended parent meetings at the school?			
3. Have you attended programs in which the children participated?			
4. Have you talked with the educational assistant?			
5. Have you observed in the program in your child's class?			
6. Have you talked with the school principal or the assistant principal?			
7. Do you know what your child does in his class at school?			

ATTITUDES

(NOTE: Please circle the number which most clearly tells how you feel about each of the statements listed below.)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	dis-agree	Strongly disagree
1. As a parent there is very little I can do to improve the schools.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX J

FORTALECER LA EDUCACION DE LA NINEZ - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

UNA ESCALA SOBRE LAS ACTITUDES Y LAS PARTICIPACION DE LOS PADRES

El numero del salon de su hijo(a)_____Escuela_____Grado______

Fecha______

Haga el favor de contestar las siguientes preguntas sobre su participacion y actutud en relacion a la escuela de su hijo(a). No es necesario firmar su nombre. Gracias!

PARTICIPACION

	Muchas veces	Algunas veces	Ninguna vez
1. Han discutido uds. el progreso de su hijo(a) conel maestro?	______	______	______
2. Han asistido uds. a las reuniones de los padres en la escuela?	______	______	______
3. Han asistido uds. a los programas de la escuela en que los ninos han participado?	______	______	______
4. Han hablado uds. con el asistente educacional?	______	______	______
5. Han observado el programa educacional de su hijo(a)?	______	______	______
6. Han discutido uds. el programa educacional de su hijo con el principal o con el asistente del principal?	______	______	______

	Muchas veces	Algunas veces	Ninguna vez
7. Saben uds. lo que su hijo(a) en la escuela?	________	________	________

ACTITUDES

(Nota: Haga el favor de poner un circulo alrededor del numero que demuestre mas claramente como se sienten uds. en relacion a los siguientes comentarios.)

	De acuerdo firmemente	De acuerdo	No Sabemos	Desacuerdo	Desacuerdo firmemente
1. Como padres hay muy poco que podamos hacer para mejorar las escuelas.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Casi todos los maestros preferirian no tener la molestia de los padres en venir a verles.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX A

BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

BILINGUAL COMMUNITY LIAISON
PARENTAL ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your child's room no.____________ School___________ Date______

Please answer the following questions about your attitude toward the services of the Bilingual Community Liaison and toward education. It is not necessary for you to sign your name. Thank you.

(A) Bilingual Community Liaison

Contacts with BCL	3 Quite a lot	2 Some	1 Not at all
1. Have you met the Bilingual Community Liaison?	________	_____	________
2. Have you discussed your child's progress with the Bilingual Community Liaison?	________	____	________
3. Have you discussed school related problems with the Bilingual Community Liaison?	________	____	________
4. Have you discussed non-school related problems with the Bilingual Community Liaison? (Jobs, housing, health services, etc.)	________	____	________
5. Has the Bilingual Community Liaison participated by serving as translator in conferences with other school personnel?	________	____	________

Rating of Services

1. How satisfied are you with the services the Bilingual Community Liaison gave you?

3. ___Very satisfied
2. ___Satisfied
1. ___Not at all satisfied

(B) Attitudes Toward Schools

(NOTE: Please circle the number which most closely tells how you feel about each of the statements listed below.)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.As a parent there is very little I can do to improve the schools.	1	2	3	4	5
2.Most teachers do not want to be bothered by parents coming to see them.	1	2	3	4	5

ASESOR DE LA COMUNIDAD BILINGUE
CUESTIONARIO SOBRE LAS ACTITUDES DE LOS PADRES

El número del salón de su hijo(a)_____ Escuela_____ Grado_____ Fecha___

Haga el favor de contestar las siguientes pregunatas sobre su actitud en relación a lost servicios del asesor de la comunidad bilingue y a la educación. No es necesario firmar su nombre. Gracias!

(A) Asesor de la Comunidad Bilingue

	3 Muchas veces	2 Algunas veces	1 Ninguna vez
1. Han conocido uds. al asesor de la comunidad bilingue?			
2. Han discutido uds. el progreso de su hijo(a) con el asesor de la comunidad bilingue?			
3. Han discutido uds. problemas relacionados a la escuela con el asesor de la comunidad bilingue?			
4. Han discutido uds. problemas no relacionados a la escuela con el asesor de la comunidad bilingue? (Por ejemplo: empleo, alojamiento, servicios de salud, etc.)			
5. Ha participado el asesor de la comunidad bilingue como intérprete en conferencias con otro personal de la escuela?			

6. Como classificaría su satisfacción con los servicios del asesor de la comunidad bilingue?

3. ___ Muy satisfecho
2. ___ Satisfecho
1. ___ No satisfecho

(B) Actitudes

(NOVA: Haga el favor de poner un circulo alrededor del número que demuestre más claramente como se sienten uds. en relación con los siguientes comentarios.)

	De acuerdo firmemente	De Acuerdo	No Sabemos	Desacuerdo	Desacuerdo firmemte
1. Como padres hay muy poco que podamos hacer para mejorar las escuelas.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Casi todos los maestros preferirían no tener la molestia de los padres en venir a verles.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX A through D

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT 24

ESL-SCALE FOR RATING ORAL LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PUPILS

Name __________ School __________ Grade __________ Date __________

ESL Teacher ______________ Fluency Rating ______________

LEVEL	I. STRUCTURAL PATTERNS	II. VOCABULARY	III. PRONUNCIATION	IV. SITUATION INTERPRETATION	V. INTONATION
F (0)	Speaks no English	Speaks no English	Speaks no English	Speaks no English	Speaks no English
E (1)	a. Repeats Teacher's models. b. Answers with single words. c. Attempts to form simple patterns	Can identify 1 or 2	Can reproduce 1-2 sounds	At least 1-2 responses	Speech has stress, pitch, & rhythm of native language
D (2)	a. Uses correct patterns for 3 or more b. Agreement of grammatical elements.	Can identify 3 or 4	Can reproduce 3-4 sounds	At least 3-4 responses	Has acquired some of the stress, pitch & rhythm of English
C (3)	Uses patterns automatically in all 5	Can identify all 5	Can reproduce all sounds	Able to answer all questions with a reasonable amount of detail	Uses stress, pitch & rhythm of English most of the time

Directions:

1. Test to be given in this order:
   a. Pronunciation; b. Vocabulary; c. Structural Patterns; d. Situation Interpretation; e. Intonation (Teacher judgment)
2. Obtain Fluency Rating:
   a. Rate child in each column
   b. Sum the ratings
   c. Divide sum by 5 to obtain fluency rating

APPENDIX B

DISTRICT 24
ESL NEW ENTRANT INFORMATION FORM
1972-1973

Fill out this form for each new student who enters your program and send to the ESL Coordinator along with the child's Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability and his/her Linguistic Capacity Index Booklet.

Child's Name ____________________ (First) ______________________ (Last)

School ________________ Grade ______ Native Language _______

ESL Teacher ___________________ Instructional Group # __________

Instruction Period(s):

Day _____ From _____ to _____

Day _____ From _____ to _____

Day _____ From _____ to _____

Day _____ From _____ to _____

Date Child Entered Program ______________________________________

Comments ____

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

DISTRICT 24
ESL EXIT INFORMATION FORM

Please complete this form for each student who leaves your program before the end of the year. If the child has been in the program for at least one month, then submit the child's post test Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability and his/her post test Linguistic Capacity Index Booklet.

Child's Name ____________________ ____________________
(First) (Last)

School ____________________ Grade ______ ESL Teacher __________

Date Child Entered Program ________ ________ ________
Month Day Year

Date Child Left Program ________ ________ ________
Month Day Year

Reason for Exit ____

____

____

____

Send this form to the ESL Coordinator at the District Office. Include post-test rating scale record form and Linguistic Capacity Index booklet if child was in the program for at least one month.

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT 24
ESL TRANSFER INFORMATION FORM
1972-1973

Fill out this form for each student who is transferred to another ESL group or teacher and return to the ESL Coordinator.

Child's Name ____________________ (First) ____________________ (Last)

School ____________ Grade ____________ ESL Teacher ____________

Student transferred to:

A. New group ____________________ Instructional Period(s):

Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____

B. Another teacher ______________________________

Reason for the transfer ______________________________

____

____

____

APPENDIX A through E

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

School ______________________________ Date __________________________

Reading Teacher's Name _________________ Code (leave blank)______

Funding: 1. Title I ___ 2. Optional Assign. ___ 3. State Urban___

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers as part of this year's program. We ask for your honest appraisal of this aspect of the program.

1. Instructions. Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the afternoon staff meetings. Use the rating scale below to evaluate the adequacy with which each was covered during training sessions. Put your rating in the space provided before the topic. For any item that was not covered, write NC.

   Scale: 5=Very Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not Covered

Rating	Topic
______	(a) Organization, administration and supervision of the program
______	(b) Objectives and rationale for the program

Rating Topic

_____ (c) Criteria for selection of program participants

_____ (d) Procedures for selection of student participants

_____ (e) Specific procedures for diagnosis

_____ (f) Knowledge of reading skills

_____ (g) Methods of corrective instruction

_____ (h) Use of instructional materials

_____ (i) Teacher selection and evaluation of program material

_____ (j) Organizing the class for instruction

_____ (k) Techniques for evaluating pupil progress

_____ (l) Record-keeping policies and procedures

_____ (m) Techniques for using paraprofessionals in the program

_____ (n) Techniques for parent involvement

_____ (o) Other (Please specify) ________________________________

____

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No ___ 2. Yes ___

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers this year.

1. Unsatisfactory___ 2. Barely Satisfactory___ 3. Average___

4. Above Average___ 5. Very Satisfactory___

4. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

1. No ___ 2. Yes ___

5. If your answer to question 4 is yes,how would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1.__________ Inferior 2.__________ About the same 3.__________ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program and your suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are item related to different aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very satisfactory, NA=Not Appropriate

Program Organization

Rating		Item
______	(a)	Organization of the program (number of classes, scheduling, etc.)
______	(b)	Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction
______	(c)	Number of pupils in each group
______	(d)	Overall Rating for Program Organization

Pupil Selection

Rating Item

______ (a) Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Procedures used to select pupil participants

______ (c) Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on basis of severity of reading retardation

______ (d) Overall Rating for Pupil Selection

Need

______ (a) Number of students serviced by the program compared to number who need corrective reading instruction

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of the room provided by the school

______ (b) Physical facilities in the room

______ (c) Adequacy of the types of instructional (workbooks, literature, audio visual aids, etc.) materials in the program

______ (d) Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced

______ (e) Availability of materials at the start of the program

______ (f) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

______ (a) Use of the Informal Reading Inventory to establish reading levels and to evaluate growth in reading

______ (b) Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading

______ (c) Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual weaknesses and strengths in reading

Rating Item

______ (d) Adequacy of materials and instruments supplied for diagnosis and evaluation

______ (e) Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program

______ (f) Overall rating for Diagnostic and Evaluative Procedures and materials used in the program

Students

______ (a) Pupils' attitude toward the corrective reading classes

______ (b) Observable improvement in pupil performance

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Extent of parent involvement in the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (c) Time to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences

Personnel Support

______ (a) Cooperation of school personnel generally

______ (b) Communication between classroom teachers and yourself about pupil progress

______ (c) Extent to which reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adapted by classroom teachers

______ (d) Amount of time provided to confer with classroom teachers

______ (e) Classroom teachers' attitudes toward Corrective Reading Program

______ (f) Supervision and assistance provided by the reading coordinator

2. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Corrective Reading Program is:

1. _______ Inferior 2. _______ About the same 3. _______ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above.)

____

____

____

____

____

SECTION C - READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

1. Paraprofessionals

(a) How many paraprofessionals were assigned to your reading program? __________

(b) Could you have used additional paraprofessionals?

Yes _____ No _____

(c) When did they begin working? ____________________

(d) Did the paraprofessionals receive any special training for the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, who provided the training? ____________

____

(e) Briefly describe responsibilities assumed by the paraprofessional(s) in your program.

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

(f) Please rate the adequacy of the paraprofessionals preparation and skills for the program

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Barely Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Above Average	Very Satisfactory

(g) What is your overall rating of the services provided by the paraprofessionals?

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatisfactory	Barely Satisfactory	Average	Above Average	Very Satisfactory

(h) Indicate your suggestions for improving the contributions that can be made by paraprofessionals in this Corrective Reading Program.

____

____

____

2. Guidance Services (Optional Assignment Program)

(a) Approximately how many of your corrective reading students received the services of the guidance counselor?

____

(b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

1	2	3	4	5
None	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Often

(c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Helpful		Helpful		Very Helpful

(d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for optional assignment students in the reading program?

____

____

____

____

SECTION D - READING TEACHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Year	Institution	Major Field

2. COURSE WORK RELEVANT TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those courses which you have taken and indicate the institution and year. (Do not include inservice courses here.)

Content of Course	Institution	Year
___Foundations of Reading Instruction	______	___
___Diagnostic Techniques - Reading	______	___
___Corrective Reading Instruction	______	___
___Reading in the Content Areas	______	___
___Teaching Individualized Reading	______	___
Other		
____________	______	___
____________	______	___

3. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

School	Grades	No. of Years	Regular or Substitute
______	___	______	________
______	___	______	________
______	___	______	________

4. EXPERIENCES SPECIFIC TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those experiences which you have had and the number of years

Experience	No. of Years
___Corrective Reading - Public Schools	______
___After-school Tutorial Reading Program	______
___Parent-volunteer Reading Tutor	______
___Private tutorial work in Reading	______
Other	
____________	______
____________	______
____________	______

5. INSERVICE COURSES IN CORRECTIVE READING

List the inservice courses relevant to Corrective Reading which you took before this academic year.

Course	Year

6. PRESENT INSERVICE COURSES

List any inservice courses related to Corrective Reading which you have taken this year.

Course	Instructor

APPENDIX B

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME____ DATE ___________

SCHOOL______________________________________

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluating the program and for making recommendations for improvement. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers as part of this year's program. Please answer to the best of your knowledge.

1. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Don't know _____

2. Give your overall rating of the adequacy of the inservice training that was provided for Corrective Reading Teachers.

   1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely satisfactory ___

   3. Average ___ 4. Above Average ___ 5. Very satisfactory ___

   (DK) Don't Know ___

3. Did any of your teachers participate in the Reimbursable Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

4. If your answer to question 3 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's inservice training program in comparison to last year's. On the whole, this year's training was:

1	2	3
Inferior	About the same	Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided for teachers in the Corrective Reading Program.

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Instructions: Listed below are items about aspects of the Corrective Reading Program in District 24. Use the following scale to evaluate the quality and/or the effectiveness of the reading program.

Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory

Program Organization

Rating		Item
______	(a)	Organization of the program (including number of classes, scheduling of classes, etc.)
______	(b)	Amount of time allocated to corrective reading instruction
______	(c)	Number of pupils in each reading group
______	(d)	Overall Rating for Program Organization

Pupil Selection

Rating Item

______ (a) Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Procedures used to select pupil participants

______ (c) Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on the basis of severity of reading retardation

______ (d) Overall Rating for Pupil Selection

Need

______ (a) Number of students serviced by the program compared to the number who need corrective reading instruction

Physical Facilities and Materials

______ (a) Size of the room(s) provided for the program

______ (b) Physical facilities in the room(s)

______ (c) Adequacy of the types of instructional materials (texts, workbooks, literature, audio visual, etc.) used in the program

______ (d) Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced

______ (e) Availability of materials at the start of the program

______ (f) Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

______ (a) Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading

______ (b) Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual strengths and weaknesses in reading

Rating Item

______ (c) Appropriateness of the materials and instruments used for diagnosis/evaluation

______ (d) Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program

______ (e) Overall Rating for Diagnosis and Evaluation

Students

______ (a) Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes

______ (b) Observable improvement in pupil performance

Parental Involvement and Attitude

______ (a) Extent of parent involvement in the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (c) Time for teachers to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences

Personnel Support

______ (a) Cooperation of school personnel generally

______ (b) Communication between corrective reading teacher(s) and classroom teachers about pupil progress

______ (c) Extent to which reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adopted by classroom teachers

______ (d) Amount of time available for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers

Rating		Item
_____	(e)	Classroom teachers' attitude toward the program
_____	(f)	Quality of the services provided by the paraprofessionals
_____	(g)	Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively in the program
_____	(h)	Adequacy of the corrective reading teachers' preparation and skills required for the program
_____	(i)	Quality of the instruction generally provided by the corrective reading teachers
_____	(j)	Ongoing supervision and guidance provided by the reading coordinator

2. Did your school participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's?

   1 _____ Inferior 2 _____ About the same 3 _____ Superior

4. Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. We would be especially interested in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above.

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

READING COORDINATOR'S EVALUATION OF CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

Name ______________________________ Date ________________

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

1. Instructions: Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the afternoon staff meetings. Using the scale below, indicate the extent to which each topic was adequately covered during these sessions.

   Scale: 5=Very staisfactory, 4=Above average, 3=Average, 2=Barely satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not covered

Rating		Topic
______	(a)	Organization, administration and supervision of the program
______	(b)	Objectives and rationale for the program
______	(c)	Criteria for selection of program participants
______	(d)	Procedures for selection of student participants
______	(e)	Specific procedures for diagnosis
______	(f)	Knowledge of reading skills
______	(g)	Methods of corrective instruction
______	(h)	Use of instructional materials
______	(i)	Teacher selection and evaluation of of program materials

Rating Topic

_____ (j) Organizing the class for instruction

_____ (k) Techniques for evaluating pupil progress

_____ (l) Record keeping policies and procedures

_____ (m) Techniques for using paraprofessionals in the program

_____ (n) Techniques for parent involvement

_____ (o) Other (Please specify) ______________________________

____

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers this year.

1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely satisfactory ___

3. Average ___ 4. Above average ___ 5. Very satisfactory ___

4. How would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1 ______ 2 ______ 3 ______

Inferior About the same Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program this year and your suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

SECTION B - COORDINATOR'S EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely satisfactory, 3=Average,
4=Above average, 5=Very satisfactory, NA=Not appropriate

Program Organization

Rating Item

______ (a) Organization of the program (number of classes, scheduling, etc.)

______ (b) Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction

______ (c) Number of pupils in each group

______ (d) Overall Rating for Program Organization

Pupil Selection

______ (a) Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Procedures used to select pupil participants

______ (c) Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on the basis of severity of reading retardation

______ (d) Overall Rating for Pupil Selection

Need

______ (a) Number of students serviced by the program compared to the number who need corrective reading instruction

Physical Facilities and Materials

Rating		Item
______	(a)	Size of the room(s) provided for the program
______	(b)	Physical facilities in the room(s)
______	(c)	Adequacy of the types of instructional materials (texts, workbooks, literature, audio visual aids, etc.) used in the program
______	(d)	Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced
______	(e)	Availability of materials at the start of the program
______	(f)	Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

______ (a) Use of the Informal Inventory to establish reading levels and to evaluate growth in reading

______ (b) Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading

______ (c) Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual weaknesses and strengths in reading

______ (d) Adequacy of materials and instruments used for diagnosis and evaluation

______ (e) Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program

______ (f) Overall Rating for Diagnostic and Evaluative Procedures

Students

______ (a) Students' attitude toward the program

______ (b) Observable improvement in pupil performance

Parental Involvement and Attitude

Rating Item

______ (a) Extent of parental involvement in the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Parents' attitude toward the program

______ (c) Time for teachers to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences

Personnel Support

______ (a) Cooperation of school personnel generally

______ (b) Communication between corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers about pupil progress

______ (c) Extent to which ideas, reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adopted by classroom teachers

______ (d) Amount of time available for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers

______ (e) Classroom teachers' attitude toward the program

______ (f) Quality of the services provided by the paraprofessionals

______ (g) Teachers' satisfaction with the services provided by the paraprofessionals

______ (h) Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively in the program

______ (i) Adequacy of the corrective reading teachers' preparation and skills required for the program

______ (j) Quality of the instruction generally provided by the corrective reading teachers

3. What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's? This year's Corrective Reading Program is:

1_______	2____________	3_______
Inferior	About the same	Superior

Please give your general evaluation of the program, indicating specific strengths and weaknesses. Feel free to comment on or to give reasons for your ratings in 1 and 2 above.

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX D

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS WITH STUDENTS IN THE REIMBURSABLE CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

YOUR NAME ______________________________ DATE ______________

SCHOOL ____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

1. How many children in your class(es) participate in the Title I, Optional Assignment or State Urban Corrective Reading Program this year? ______________________________

2. Instructions: Listed below are items about aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program:

Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory, NA=Not Appropriate

Program Organization

Rating — Item

______ (a) Organization and scheduling of corrective reading classes

______ (b) Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction

______ (c) Overall Rating for Program Organization

Need

______ (a) Number of children serviced by the program compared to number who need corrective reading instruction

Pupil Selection

Rating **Item**

______ (a) Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program

______ (b) Procedures used to select pupils

______ (c) Overall Rating for Pupil Selection

Student and Parent Attitudes

______ (a) Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes

______ (b) Observable improvement in students' reading performance during regular class activities

______ (c) Parents' attitude toward children's participation in the Corrective Reading Program

Support

______ (a) Communication between corrective reading teacher(s) and yourself about pupil progress

______ (b) Extent to which you have adopted ideas, materials, procedures and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program

______ (c) Amount of time available to confer with corrective reading teacher(s)

3. Did any children in your class last year participate in the Corrective Reading Program (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

4. If your answer to 3 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:

1 ______	2 ______	3 ______
Inferior	About the same	Superior

5. Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

____

____

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX E

INDEX OF READING ATTITUDE

School ______________________ Name ______________________

Teacher ______________________ Grade ________ Date ______

Circle the number which most closely tells how you feel about each of the statements listed below.

1 - almost always
2 - often
3 - sometimes
4 - not often
5 - almost never

1. Reading makes me feel good. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I read the newspaper. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I read before I go to bed. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Free reading time is the best part of school. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I like it when the teacher reads aloud. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I talk about books I have read. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I am a good reader for my age. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I get good grades on reading tests. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I read when I can do what I want to do. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Reading is my favorite subject at school. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I read magazines. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I read comic books. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I like to read paperbacks. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I like to talk about books I have read. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I like to read aloud. 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX A

GUIDANCE SERVICES

APPENDIX A

OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST

To be completed by classroom or homeroom teacher:

Pupil's Name________________________Grade_____Age_____Teacher________

Corrective Rdg Teacher_____________Resident__________________________

Optional Assignment________________

Compared to the rest of the children in your class, please rate the above-named student on the following characteristics.

Circle appropriate rating

	0 Don't Know	1 40 or below	2 50	3 60	4 70	5 80	6 90
Academic Skills							
Reading	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Math	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Social Studies	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Creative Expression (Art, music, writing)	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Science	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

Social Skills (As observed during past month)

Approximate number of times observed

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Inattentive	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Follows directions	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Completes tasks	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Easily led by peers	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Feelings easily hurt	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Disrupts Class	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Negative and aggressive to authority	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Fights with peers	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Destroys property	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

Please specify other problem characteristics this student exhibits

____

____

To be completed by Guidance Counselor

Attendance Record:

____

____

____

Group __________ Non-Group __________

Dates of individual contacts with Counselor:

____

____

____

Number of group sessions attended:

____

____

Dates of home visits: (By paraprofessional, counselor, or other)

____

____

Dates of telephone contacts with parents:

____

____

Dates of parent interviews held in school:

____

____

Dates of contacts with Corrective Reading Teacher, subject teachers:

____

____

____

Dates of agency contacts:

____

____

____

____